

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY

AND

URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

---

VOL. VI. 1873.

---

EDITED BY

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D.,

PROF. J. H. GOOD, D.D., Tiffin, Ohio,

AND

REV. J. H. KLEIN, D.D., Louisville, Ky.

---

CATAUNBA COLLEGE  
SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA

LANCASTER, PA.:

PRINTED BY PEARSOL & GEIST, 22 SOUTH QUEEN-ST.

THE  
RICHMOND GAZETTE  
MONTHLY

UNION FOR THE FUTURE

VOL. 7, 1873

CATAWBA COLLEGE  
241232RYNORTH CAROLINA



## CONTENTS.

### JANUARY.

	PAGE.
Thank God and Take 'Courage, - - -	1
Frank, but Suggestive, - - -	6
The Second Helvetic Confession, - - -	7
Tendency, - - -	10
Two Types of Piety, - - -	12
The General Synod at Cincinnati, - - -	17
Eastern Synod versus General Synod, - - -	29
Facts versus Boasting, - - -	37
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
Ursinus College Repertory, - - -	39
Schaff Literary Society, - - -	39
Papal Infallibility, - - -	41
Moral Courage, - - -	46
College Items, - - -	49
Proclamation of Religious Toleration in Japan, - - -	52
Editor's Desk, - - -	53
Book Notices, - - -	58
Monthly Summary, - - -	61

### FEBRUARY.

Looking Unto Jesus, - - -	65
The General Synod at Cincinnati, - - -	70
The Second Helvetic Confession, - - -	81
What Does it Mean? - - -	85
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
Master your own Language, - - -	97
Silent Influence, - - -	99
College Items, - - -	102
Editor's Desk, - - -	103
Monthly Summary, - - -	106

### MARCH.

Looking Unto Jesus, - - -	109
The Help of the Lord, - - -	115
The Second Helvetic Confession, - - -	117
Lower Stone Church, - - -	122
The General Synod at Cincinnati, - - -	125
Elder Dunn and the Messenger, - - -	140
Official and Personal, - - -	143
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
Cicero's Dream of Scipio, - - -	146
Unity of Society, - - -	149
College Items, - - -	152

	PAGE.
Editor's Desk, - - -	153
Book Notices, - - -	154
Monthly Summary, - - -	158

### APRIL.

The Simplicity that is in Christ, - - -	164
Through Christ, - - -	168
The Second Helvetic Confession, - - -	171
Lower Stone Church, - - -	177
Special meeting of the Eastern Synod, - - -	180
The Church Misrepresented, - - -	186
A Significantly Interesting Occasion, - - -	190

#### URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

Our Purpose in Life, - - -	199
True Reform, - - -	202
The Necessity of Popular Education, - - -	207
College Items, - - -	209
Editor's Desk, - - -	211
Book Notices, - - -	213
Monthly Summary, - - -	214

### MAY.

"One Meditator," - - -	217
Living Testimony, - - -	221
Through Christ, - - -	227
The Second Helvetic Confession, - - -	232
The Powers of the General Synod, - - -	239
The Lancaster Ovation, - - -	244
The Evangelical Alliance, - - -	253

#### URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

How to be Happy, - - -	257
The Duties of Life, - - -	260
College Items, - - -	263
Editor's Desk, - - -	264
Monthly Summary, - - -	267

### JUNE.

The Pentecost of Caesarea, - - -	271
Error and its Advocates, - - -	278
The Second Helvetic Confession, - - -	280
Attraction of Romanism for Un- easy Protestants, - - -	287
Regeneration by Baptism, - - -	291



	PAGE.		PAGE.
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		Book Notices, - - - - -	489
God in History, - - - - -	301	Monthly Summary, - - - - -	489
Trost Der Religion, - - - - -	308	OCTOBER.	
Die Wahre Bestimmung des		Discouraging the Heart, - - -	491
Menschen, - - - - -	311	A Flat Contradiction, - - -	499
College Items, - - - - -	314	The Second Helvetic Confession, -	502
Editor's Desk, - - - - -	315	Rome's Spirit, - - - - -	505
Book Notices, - - - - -	316	The Crisis in the English Church, -	507
Monthly Summary, - - - - -	318	The Nevinite Doctrine of Regen-	
JULY.		eration by Baptism, - - -	512
The Union Movement, - - - - -	325	What they mean by Development, -	521
Regeneration by Baptism, - - -	344	URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
The Second Helvetic Confession, -	353	National Education Associa-	
A Negro Sermon in Florida, - - -	360	tion, - - - - -	525
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		College Items, - - - - -	533
The Certainty of Christian		Editor's Desk, - - - - -	536
Truth, - - - - -	361	Book Notices, - - - - -	541
The Limits of Knowledge, - - -	370	Monthly Summary, - - - - -	542
Literary Criticism, - - - - -	373	NOVEMBER.	
College Items, - - - - -	377	The Ground of our Salvation, - -	545
Editor's Desk, - - - - -	385	The Second Helvetic Confession, -	549
Book Notices, - - - - -	387	"Dr. Nevin and the Rest of Us,"	
Monthly Summary, - - - - -	387	or, G. D. Wolff's Allega-	
AUGUST.		tions, - - - - -	552
Religious Element in Education, -	389	Ye shall Know Them by Their	
Regeneration by Baptism, - - -	401	Fruits, - - - - -	560
Nevinism a Feeder for Rome, - -	409	The Evangelical Alliance, - - -	562
Another Victim of Nevinism, - -	413	Regeneration by Baptism, - - -	569
Bismarck and the Clergy, - - -	419	Giving, - - - - -	578
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		Emphasis, - - - - -	579
Modern Science, - - - - -	421	URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
The Ursinus Union of the Re-		Our Literary Societies, - - -	580
formed Church, - - - - -	424	Catawba College, North Caro-	
College Items, - - - - -	426	lina, - - - - -	582
Editor's Desk, - - - - -	430	College Items, - - - - -	584
Monthly Summary, - - - - -	432	Editor's Desk, - - - - -	587
SEPTEMBER.		Book Notices, - - - - -	592
Paul Smitten on the Mouth, - -	437	Monthly Summary, - - - - -	593
Guide-Posts, - - - - -	441	DECEMBER.	
Rev. Edward O. Forney, - - -	443	Knowing God Aright, - - -	599
After the Wolves, - - - - -	451	The Second Helvetic Confession, -	604
Who are Reformed and Protest-		Stand Fast in the Faith, - - -	608
ant Yet? - - - - -	454	The Russians and the Russo-	
Rev. E. O. Forney's Defection, -	459	Greek Church, - - - - -	613
Nevin's Doctrine of Regenera-		What Is It? - - - - -	617
tion and Baptism tested by		Not to the Point, - - - - -	623
Reformed Standards, - - -	461	The Old Catholic Movement, -	631
The True Nature and End of Re-		URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.	
ligion, - - - - -	471	The Earliest Language, - - -	634
URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.		Dorner and Christlieb, - - -	637
Show Thyself a Man, - - -	475	College Items, - - - - -	641
College Items, - - - - -	477	Editor's Desk, - - - - -	642
Editor's Desk, - - - - -	479	Book Notices, - - - - -	646
		Monthly Summary, - - - - -	646



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.—JANUARY, 1873.—No. 1.

THANK GOD AND TAKE COURAGE.

ST. PAUL is said to have done so. He did so under circumstances and in a spirit which will richly repay a half hour's earnest study by the lessons they supply for the beginning of another year of grace. (Acts 28: 15.)

A prisoner for the cause of Christ, the Apostle had been taken from Palestine to Italy. The voyage was a long and perilous one. But its perils and tediousness had been made occasions of proving the power and goodness of the Lord, and had afforded His chosen servant many opportunities of displaying the excellency of those virtues which spring from Christian faith and hope. Amidst the dangers of the storm-tossed sea, his confidence had not failed. During the gloom of the darkest night of those dangers, there had "stood by him an angel of God," cheering him. And now, safely landed at the port of Cæsar's capital, he was nearing Rome. But he was nearing it as a captive prisoner, charged with crimes which the tribunal of Rome regarded with abhorrence and punished with death.

It is not hard sufficiently to realize his circumstances to enable one to enter largely into his feelings. Though a sincere Christian, and a zealous messenger or apostle of Jesus Christ, he was still a man. He had all the sensibilities of a man, and those, indeed, made more tender and susceptible by his genuine piety. The Paul who begged Timothy to send him the *cloak* he had left at Troas, feeling the need of it in his cold prison, may well be thought to have felt the need of some friendly consolation, as he



found himself a stranger, and that a prisoner, in a strange land, and about to be tried for his life.

Such comfort was provided for him. The faithful High-priest, whom he served, knew his need, was touched with a feeling of his infirmity, having himself been tried by a like temptation, and sent forth *brethren* to meet their afflicted brother. When Paul saw them and received their cordial greeting, his soul revived. In them he recognized the grace of the Lord, which had moved them to this act of gentle, considerate brotherly kindness. He discerned the lineament of Jesus' love in their faces. As they embraced him, it was as though the arms of the Redeemer were thrown around him. Their words were as though the Lord Himself were cheering him. "He thanked God, and took courage." And so, with a thankful and emboldened heart, he pressed forward on his way, entered the city, submitted to imprisonment, and hopefully awaited the trials which might be yet in store for him.

But who has not reason, at every point in his journey through life, for like gratitude and courage? In their peculiar outward form, our dangers and deliverances may differ from those of the apostle. No fierce Euroclydon may have rushed forth against us, no tempestuous ocean may have threatened to swallow us up, no prisoner's chains may have bound our hands or clanked at our feet, and no dungeon of pagan Rome have been prepared for us. We may have been mercifully spared all such trials, or any resembling them. If so, the greater our reason for devout gratitude to Him under whose sheltering fatherly care we have been led along. Our less trying experience, in this respect, has not been owing to the greater real safety of our course, but rather to the loving kindness of the Lord who has watched over our paths.

And yet it is most probable that every one, on seriously reviewing the events of the past year, can recall many occasions of deliverance from threatening evils, temporal or spiritual, which, as now seen, will be felt to have been far greater than they seemed to be at the time. It is, furthermore, not only probable but altogether certain, that during the same period, more favors than can be numbered and blessings far greater than we can duly estimate, have been lavished upon us.

Shall either the deliverances or the blessings be forgotten or undervalued? Shall we so thoughtlessly dismiss the consideration of them as to lose the great spiritual advantages they offer?



Among the two-fold experiences of the past thus brought to mind, there are many which concern each one privately and personally. They are, therefore, in their very nature, such as cannot be named in detail, and as need not be so particularized. It is enough for each one to know them and recount them in the chambers of the heart, and in that other closet where the loving child of God delights in holding secret fellowship with his Father. These perils escaped, though unknown, by other temptations overcome, and trials overruled for good, may be reviewed until the heart, melted by the remembrance, pours forth with a fervor of thankfulness never before felt, its "Bless the Lord, O my soul, \* \* who hath delivered thy life from destruction." What those perils have been, it is enough that the heart knows, and the Lord.

There too may each one reflect upon trials endured and burdens of sorrow borne, and of wonderful grace proportioned to need of it, all unwritten, and hidden from the eyes of men, but open to the eye of Omniscience, until the silence of our secret resort is broken with a song of praise to God. Only we must take heed to exclude from this reviewed list of our burdens and trials, those imaginary ones which we often multiply to ourselves, or such as we may have invited and nursed by a false and morbid view of life and its various relations. Such evils, and the griefs they may occasion us, are in no sense from the Lord, but the fruits of our own weakness and folly. Instead of pitying ourselves for having passed through them, we rather should reproach ourselves for yielding to thoughts and sentiments by which they may have been occasioned. The chief advantage which may be derived from a remembrance of them is, that it may serve as a warning to us not to yield again to the like infirmity.

But if in such secluded retirement each one will find himself moved to gratitude by the thought of trials safely passed, how much greater cause for thankfulness will be found in the consideration of *private personal blessings* received during the days of the departed year! More directly than the dew-drops upon the tender flower, have many of the Lord's mercies descended upon our heads and refreshed our hearts. They were peculiarly personal. No one else saw them, heard them, or felt them. The whispered promise came to our ear alone. The strengthening touch, like that of the angel upon the desponding prophet in the desert,



thrilled through our spirit alone. Others may have seen the happy effect ; but we alone knew of the heavenly cause, *felt* from whom the reviving virtue came. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him." And the remembrance of what He has done for their souls, above all that the world or even their nearest earthly friends were aware of, and in ways invisible to mortal eyes, may well excite the warmest emotions of their hearts, and call forth the most sincere thanksgivings of their lips.

But beyond all such pleasant experiences of the personal inner life of each Christian, there have been deliverances from common dangers, and there has been an enjoyment of common mercies which justly claim devout consideration, and prompt to joyful thanksgiving at the opening of another year. Let each one contemplate the past in this more general view, from whatever position he may occupy in life, and through whatever relations he may sustain, and it will scarcely be possible not to see abundant cause for gratitude and courage. In the household, in society, in the State, in the church, the good hand of the Lord will be seen to have been constantly opened in relieving wants, or stretched out in defending against evil, or in delivering out of it. Some homes, and even cities, have been consumed by devouring flames; but how many more have been warmed by fires restrained from breaking forth to hurt and to destroy. Some lands have been overrun by desolating floods, which have swept away men and their habitations, the cattle and the products of their fields ; but how many more have been visited with the early and the latter rains in their seasons, to the great increase of the fertility of the soil and the supply of superabundant crops. Some districts have been laid waste by tempests and hurricanes rushing with irresistible fury in their course, but to how many more and how much broader districts have the winds of heaven dispensed health and life. And as to that most dreadful scourge with which the nations of the earth can be visited, the scourge which the heroic Psalmist deprecated more than pestilence or plague, the sound of its strife and clangor has scarcely been heard. The year past has been made memorable as a year of almost universal peace. Spears have been turned into plow-shares, and swords into pruning-hooks. The review of such a scene may well inspire the heart with gratitude and courage.

Still more must this be felt, if our point of view is changed to a position from which the great things which the Lord has done for



His church may be contemplated. Here, most notably, may the Christian see how signally the cause of truth and salvation has been favored and advanced. The year has been one not without its threatening perils to that cause, but still more a year of large ingatherings and cheering progress. In home and foreign fields tens of thousands have been gathered into the good Shepherd's fold. Heathenism has been constrained to lower its walls and open its gates for the triumphant entry of the Gospel of the Prince of peace. Popery, the most formidable foe of Christianity, because by subtle artifices entrenched for a thousand years within the camp, and toiling with subtle craft to keep its grasp firm upon the holiest interests of the kingdom of grace, has been rebuked and spurned by the very powers of earth with which, as the apostate bride of the Lamb, it had long dallied in sinful pleasures. Divisions which had long separated members of the true church from each other, in unnatural and needless estrangements, have been healed or are disappearing, so that those holding the like precious faith in all essential points, are uniting their strength for a common warfare and for common work. Even things which may have seemed most unfavorable and threatening, have been overruled for the furtherance of the cause whose progress they appeared likely to impede. Who that surveys the past year in the light of such cheering facts, can help but thank God and take courage. And this may be the more heartily done, the more clearly we may remember the fears with which the year may have been begun.

Of the special application of all this to our peculiar experience as a church, it is not needful to write. All who love the faith of our fathers, as that "once delivered to the saints," will gladly recognize in the events of the past year, and especially some connected with its closing month, the most abundant reasons for thankfulness and hope. Even though they may rejoice with trembling, they still rejoice. Rocks which seemed to threaten certain shipwreck, have been safely crossed. Tendencies, mistakes, which appeared to involve an inevitable catastrophe of evil, have been surmounted. Let God be devoutly thanked for what He has wrought.

But let the gratitude inspired, rekindle courage, too. There is still need of courage. The place of full rest, of entire freedom from conflict, is not yet reached. There are other reefs to pass;



there are other conflicts to be fought out. To meet these as they should be met, and to struggle through them to a triumphant final issue, will require enduring courage. Such courage, the grateful remembrance of the past is calculated to inspire. And, doubtless, the Lord seeks to excite and sustain it by what He has already done. The mercies of days gone by are His pledge of others as signal and as great, or even greater, should they be needed. In helping hitherto, He has reared an Ebenezer of promise for the future. By having borne the vessel so safely through Euroclydon, He gives assurance of His power and readiness to carry it securely through any other tempests which may arise.

If only we sincerely thank Him, in joyful consideration of what He has done, and confidently cleave to Him and His word of truth and grace, in reliance upon His faithfulness, we may press courageously onward, assured of the ultimate triumph of His cause over every form of error, and all the antagonisms of sin.

---

#### FRANK, BUT SUGGESTIVE.

NOR long since a Bishop Martin, of the Roman Catholic church, frankly said—

“I am Bishop, not only over the Catholics, but also over the Protestants of my diocese. The Catholic church has the right to visit with the severest corporal punishment the Christians who transgress the Catholic laws, namely, the schismatics and heretics; that is to say, the Greeks and Protestants, for the church is not only a spiritual but also an earthly kingdom.”

This is plain. But it is only the law of the church whose boast is, that it is always the same—that it never changes. If she had the power to speak and act out her principles in this country, can any one doubt she would profess and practice the very thing this Bishop here affirms? Yet how many send to her schools, and would place her devotees or her tools in office? Is there not danger—fearful danger—to all our civil and religious liberties from the whole system?



THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

CHAPTER XII.

*Of the Law of God.*

WE teach that in the law of God His will is laid before us ; what He would have us to do, or not to do ; what is good and just, and what is evil and unjust. We therefore confess, that "The Lord is good and holy." Rom. 7 : 12.

This law, we say, is partly written by the finger of God in the hearts of men, and so is called the Law of Nature, (Rom. 2 : 15) ; or written by the finger of God upon the two tables of Moses, (Ex. 22 : 1, 17 ; Deut. 5 : 22), and expounded more at large in His books.

For the sake of clearness, we distinguish the *Moral Law*, contained in the Ten Commandments or the two tables of Moses ; and the *Ceremonial Law*, treating of ceremonies and the worship of God ; and the *Civil Law*, which ordered the political and domestic affairs.

We believe that in this law of God, the whole will of God and all precepts necessary for every life relation, are set forth most fully, else God would not have forbidden that anything should be added or taken from it, (Deut. 4 : 12) ; neither would He have commanded us to walk strictly according to it, and not swerve either to the right or left. Isa. 30 : 21 ; Joshua 1 : 7.

We believe that this law was given to man, *not* that by the keeping of it he might become just (or justified), but rather that by its judgment men might be brought to a knowledge of their weakness, their sinfulness and condemnation ; and that despairing in *our own* strength, we might turn unto Christ by faith. Rom. 4 : 15 ; Rom. 3 : 19, 20 ; Gal. 3 : 21, 24.

For no man could, nor can now, satisfy the law of God and fulfil it, by reason of the weakness which still cleaves to and remains in our flesh until the last breath. The Apostle says : "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, &c." Rom. 8 : 3 ; Rom. 10 : 4. Christ is the end of the law and our fulfilling of it. He took away the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Gal. 3 : 13. So He communicates to us, through faith, His satisfaction, and imparts unto us His righteousness and His obedience.

Consequently, the law is so far abrogated, that it no more condemns us or works wrath in us. "For we are under grace and not under the law." Rom. 6: 14. Furthermore, Christ has fulfilled all types of the law; the shadow ceased when the body itself came, and we now in Christ have all truth and fullness. Yet we do not on this account disdain or reject the law. We remember the words of the Lord: "I am come not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them." Matt. 5: 17.

We know that in the law there are laid before us the patterns of the virtues and vices. We know that the written law, when it is explained through the Gospel, is profitable for the church, and hence must not be banished out of the church. Although the countenance of Moses was covered by a vail, yet the Apostle teaches us that the veil is taken away through Christ. 2 Cor. 3: 14. We therefore reject all that older and later heretics have taught against the law of God.

#### CHAPTER XIII.

##### *Of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, of the Promises, of the spirit and of the Letter.*

The Gospel, it is true, stands over against the law. For the law works wrath and denounces the curse; but the Gospel is grace and blessing. Rom. 4: 15; John 1: 17; Deut. 27: 26.

Yet it is quite certain that they which were under the law, were not without the Gospel. They had the great promise: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." Gen. 3: 15. "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. Gen. 49: 10. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah . . . until Shiloh come." Gen. 49: 10. "I will raise them up a prophet, &c." Deut. 18: 18.

And we acknowledge that the fathers had two kinds of promises revealed them, even as we have. The one kind had respect to things of this life, such as the promises relating to the land of Canaan and their victories; as we also have the promise in respect to our daily bread. The others were, then, and are also now, concerning heavenly and everlasting things; namely, God's grace, the forgiveness of sins and life everlasting, through faith in Jesus Christ. But the fathers had not only outward and earthly promises, but also spiritual and heavenly ones in Christ Jesus.



From 1 Peter 1 : 10, and Rom. 1 : 2, it is plain that the fathers were not altogether destitute of the Gospel.

Although in this way the fathers had the Gospel in the writings of the prophets, by which they laid hold of salvation in Christ through faith ; yet, in the proper sense, that " glad tidings " is called the Gospel, which first was proclaimed to the world through John the Baptist, then through Christ the Lord himself ; afterwards by His Apostle and their successors, namely, that God has now fulfilled what He promised from the beginning, and has sent, yea, and given unto us *His own Son* ; and in Him reconciliation with the Father, the forgiveness of sins, all fullness and eternal life.

The written history, by the four Evangelists, which sets forth how these things were done and fulfilled in Christ, what He did and what He taught, and that all who believe in him have all fullness—this is truly called the Gospel.

Also the preaching and the writings of the Apostles, wherein they show how the Son was given as of the Father, and *in Him* all things pertaining to life and salvation ; this also is correctly called the Gospel, or Evangelical *doctrine*, so that even at the present day, if we are sincere, it does not lose this worthy name.

It is precisely this Evangelical preaching which by the Apostle is termed Spirit, and the " Ministry of the Spirit," (2 Cor. 3 : 8), because it becomes so powerful and living through faith, in the ears, yea, in the hearts of believers, through the illumination of the Holy Spirit. For the letter (in antithesis to the Spirit) signifies indeed, everything outward, but especially the doctrine of the law, which, without Spirit and faith, works wrath and stirs up sin in those not awakened to living faith. For which reason it is also called by the Apostle, "the ministry of death." 2 Cor. 3 : 6, 8. The false Apostles preached the Gospel, corrupted by an intermingling of the law ; as though Christ could not save without the law. Such were the Ebionites and the Nazarites, who were also called Shineans.

All such we reject, and preach the Gospel unmixed, teaching that believers are justified through the Spirit alone, and not through the law. This matter will be more fully explained in the chapter on justification.



## TENDENCY.

THE Rhinebeck, N. Y., *Tribune* says: "One week from to-morrow (Sept. 29, 1872), Rev. H. E. Ziegenfuss will close his pastoral relations with the *Lutheran* church. In a few weeks he will be *confirmed* in the Protestant *Episcopal* church and take orders for the priesthood in the latter denomination;" neither is this an isolated case. Already two other young Lutheran clergymen have preceded this one in their perversion to the Episcopal church, within a short time. These *fast* young Lutherans belonged to that portion in the Lutheran church of this country, which styles itself "The general council." It is a secession from the general Synod, or rather an expansion of the old Pennsylvania Synod, in opposition to the general Synod. It has of late years become exceedingly "*old Lutheran*," under the lead of Dr. Krauth (Dr. Nevin's friend), and under such teaching as that of Prof. Fritschel, whom Dr. Apple admires. In this *branch* of the Lutheran church, extreme views on the sacraments, the church, etc., are current, and "*the Liturgical spirit*" has been warmly cherished, and these are the fruits this retrogression is bearing so abundantly. To members of the Reformed church this perversion is no surprise—we who have once felt amazement at the defections from our church and ministry to the Romish church, are no more astonished when we learn that Dr. Giesy, Zahner and Ziegenfuss have become members of Rome's obedient child. It was to be looked for, that since the teachings in the pulpits and Seminary of the general council, and those of Lancaster and the pseudo pulpits, were so essentially alike, that they would bear fruit of the same kind. It does not make any difference whether the teacher be Nevin or Krauth—Appel or Fritschel, the impulses given to the fanatical mind of youth will be the same. It is indiscernable how it should be otherwise than that those teachings which distinguish this school of theology should be held with more certainty, but that honesty will drive to Puseyism, and from Puseyism as they grow stronger, to Rome itself. There is no logical or theological stopping place until the final goal is reached inside the Vatican, at the Pope's feet. It is possible for men to exist whose opinions and actions do not *consist*. It is possible that considerations may hinder the following in practice of the convictions of the judgment, but this does not prove that honest conduct should not cause all the disciples of



these schools to proceed either directly or via Lanbek, to Rome, as their convictions may be more or less clear. It is very clear, 1. That if Reformed and Lutheran parents do not wish their sons perverted to Episcopacy or Romanism, they must not commit their training to those who hold and, directly or indirectly, inculcate doctrines, theories, and usages that naturally and logically lead away from evangelical Protestantism, and over to Popery.

2. That at the present showing, those Reformed and Lutheran institutions which are under this system of error, are fruitful feeders to the Episcopal and Romish churches. The pulpits—the editorial staff and the teachers of the schools of the Romish church—are now largely replenished from these grand old Evangelical churches.

3. It becomes a serious question for the members of these Reformed and Lutheran churches, who do not wish to have their own denominations *merged* in the Romish and Episcopal churches or *swallowed up* by them, to consider how far it is wise to bestow their money in endowments for the colleges and seminaries whose training seems to fit so many for the churches of England and Rome.

4. These perversions must be exceedingly painful to those who adhere from conviction to the old landmarks. As long as they are not separated by a great fixed gulf from those they love, separation can be borne; but when the children of Reformed and Lutheran parents not only renounce their father's faith and church, but stigmatize them as heathen, close their pulpits against them, shut them out from their communion table; when children renounce the baptism, the confirmation, and the ministry of the church of their birth, then the wound must be most excruciating to those who nurtured and loved them. But who can envy the place or the feelings of the pastor or the teacher under whose hand and practice this perversion has been initiated, fostered and completed. Infatuation, it seems, has settled on the minds and hearts of those who renounce the faith they are sworn to hold and teach, while with reckless zeal they tear down the fabric of faith their fathers reared. How long shall this continue? How long will the Reformed and Lutheran churches submit to see their existence slowly and surely undermined, to build up antagonistic systems of error? Would to God that a day of awakening were at hand, when all these evils might be corrected, and our churches and schools cleansed of the errors now abounding in them. ULRIC.



## TWO TYPES OF PIETY.

THE tree must be judged by its fruit. It is logical to reason backward from effect to cause. By noting effects, their various operations and peculiarities, you can determine shades of distinction also in the cause which has led to those effects. It is said that some able naturalists, by possessing a single bone, can determine the size, structure, and habits of the animal to which it belonged. This is because the laws of nature are uniform. There is a uniform relation between all the parts; and having one of these, you can judge correctly of all the rest. It is the same with the fruit of the tree. Having the fruit, you can judge of the nature of the tree. The flavor, size and medical properties of the fruit, will enable you to determine the locality or climate of the tree, and the class to which it belongs.

Our Saviour applied this rule, especially to morals and religion. We must judge of doctrines and systems of theology by the type of piety which they produce among the people; by their effect on the individual, social and political condition of communities. Religion affects the whole life of a nation. It has a greater or less influence upon every man, woman and child in it. It will, to a greater or less degree, determine all the institutions, habits, and manners of a people. There is no interest so universal and thorough in its effects upon the mind, as religion. It does more to civilize, educate, and refine, or to depress, blind and retard, than any other single cause. If a man lives an ungodly life, we can justly conclude that his moral and religious education has been neglected. If a nation exhibits morality and progress, or vice and ignorance, we can justly conclude that religion has had something to do with it, and must either be defective in its doctrines, or in the power to enforce its teachings upon the soul. The spirit of God is a spirit of holiness. Christianity is the absolute truth. It was intended to produce the highest style of man, to work righteousness, the moral, civil and religious advancement of the people. Where it has not produced this effect, we must conclude that there is something wrong in the apprehension of its teachings, or in the method of its application to the soul of man.

Religion may either reach a man through his intellect, or through his feelings and imagination. In the first case, without

faith, it will result in bold rationalism. In the other case, it has two tendencies. It may use the emotional and nervous temperament, and result in fanaticism; or it may ignore the intellect, and result in superstition.

In the first case, where there is faith, there results an intelligent piety, which first takes hold upon the intellect and then operates upon the heart and feelings. The second appeals to the feelings, takes hold of them, controls them, and then operates upon the intellect. In the first case we have an intelligent and competent guide, which determines what the word of God requires. In the other we have a blind obedience, a zeal without knowledge, which slavishly submits to an outward authority.

The first method uses the word of God as the great means for the regeneration and conversion of men and the salvation of the world. It pleases God by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe. It appeals to the intellect, and says, "Come, let us reason together." It enlightens the sinner as to his duties toward himself and to God. It enters the mind, and from the reason which it has convinced, it acts upon the conscience, which it alarms, and convicts the sinner of the violation of the law of God by a depraved nature. It plants the seed of regeneration (1st Peter 1: 23). It guides the conduct and character (Ps. 119: 105.) It determines the nature of man's religion and of his right to be admitted to heaven (Rev. 22: 10.)

This method begets a peculiar type of piety. It shows itself in a strict and even austere manner. It makes much account of inward experiences, self-examination, and personal application of the truth to the conscience, and personal holiness and morality. It seeks constant approval from the word of God. It loves a simple worship, divested of all pomp and display—in which the preaching of the Word occupies the chief place—and discards every attraction of art, such as painting, instrumental music, gorgeous architecture, and a pompous ritual, which might serve to divert the attention from the Word and reduce it to a subordinate place in the service. It uses the sacraments only as helps to piety, and not as original channels for its communication. It allows no repetition of the sacrifice once made for all. It does not reject art in its proper place, but is afraid of its interference with what it regards the great and leading channel for the communication of the spirit of God, and working conversion by the operation of the truth.



It admits of the supernatural character or element of Christianity as much as the other system, but receives that supernatural element by and through the Word. It admits of the truth of the Apostles' Creed, but does not place it above the Bible, but regards it simply as an exposition of Bible doctrine, and to be received only because it teaches the truth of the Bible, and forms a short and compact summary of scriptural truth. It does not determine the truth of the Bible by the Creed, but determines the truth of the Creed by the Bible. In its influence upon social life, it has produced strictness of demeanor, rigid morals, strong opposition to all worldliness, such as dancing, intemperance, fashionable flummery in dress, theatres, and social revelry of all kinds. It inclines to puritanic staidness, plainness of dress, and abstinence from worldly gaiety. In its effect upon the national life, it has produced strict morality and a quiet Sabbath, on which no labor or amusements are allowed, and requires that the day be exclusively devoted to the service of religion. It regards the education of the masses as of the highest importance; and, instead of keeping them in ignorance, is active in founding schools and colleges, under the care and fostering influence of religion. No type of religion has ever done so much for the spread of the gospel among the heathen, for the enlightenment and advancement of mankind in art, science and benevolence. Its fruits are rich, varied and unprecedentedly abundant in whatever concerns the moral, social and spiritual advancement of nations. For the proof, look at those nations where this type of religion prevails. Compare Holland with Portugal; Prussia with Austria; England with Ireland; and the United States with Mexico and South America. From its principle of private judgment, it has taught the people to think for themselves, and has prepared them for free government, by teaching a universal kingship or sovereignty on the one hand, and the proper relationship of authority to obedience on the other. Only where this type of religion has prevailed, has a Republic been formed; and wherever it has gone, it has advanced the cause of the people against tyranny. The Republics of Holland, England under the Puritans, Switzerland and the United States, are proofs of its teachings and the fruit of its piety. The reaction in England against the Commonwealth, under Charles II., and the reestablishment of monarchy, were the result of high-church tendencies revived from the first blow given by the Puritans. Such, in brief, are the fruits

of Evangelical Protestantism, as taught by the Reformers and embodied in all the catechisms of the Reformation—the Heidelberg Catechism among the rest.

On the other hand, we hear the high-church theory, which makes the supernatural grace reach the sinner through grace-bearing sacraments. It comes as an outward power and forms the church, and the church forms the Bible and makes the Bible subordinate to the church. It acts not through the preaching of the Gospel upon the mind and conscience, but by a blind submission to authority and reception of the teachings of the church. Regeneration is implanted by water baptism, and sins are forgiven by a declaration of the fact in the name of the forgiver. A sacrifice is offered upon an altar, and the body and blood of the Lamb of God are exhibited to the people. "Around this sacrifice the whole Christian worship revolves." This sacrifice, thus repeatedly exhibited in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is of greater importance than the preaching of the Word. The altar is, therefore, placed in a more prominent place, and the pulpit at one side. The service consists of a long ritual and a short sermon. The ritual is connected with many adornments of art, paintings, music, vestments, architecture, to divert the gaping and ignorant multitude, and to stop their thinking, by keeping the senses busy in receiving. The sermon makes no rousing appeal, but is filled with empty platitudes and pleasing flowers of speech. It does not seek to elevate the "lower orders;" and its system of education is a stern discipline, to teach the necessity of submitting to a higher authority in church and State. It says to the pulpit: "You have no right to think for yourself. All you can do, is to act and believe as I tell you." Its tendency in social life is to grant indulgence in worldly pleasures, in consideration of great vigor and devotion to the form of the service. Its votaries are usually found to be very lax in respect to theatres, dancing, dissipation, and social rows, under the name of fashionable parties. This is particularly the case as the season approaches toward Lent, when the reins are let loose in order to take advantage of their liberty before the season commences, when they are expected to put themselves under greater self-denial.

In its effect upon nations, it has done little for the improvement of the masses. To this day they are left in debasement and ignorance. No zeal has been manifested to improve the intellectual



and moral condition of the great body of the people; the general principle being adopted that, if you gain the ruling classes, you gain over the whole nation. It seeks, therefore, rather the possession of power than the improvement of mankind. It requires a blind obedience to its behests, and does not encourage investigation. It has, therefore, been a convenient instrument to monarchs, in holding sway over oppressed subjects. It has never favored free government, and no Republic except in name (as Venice), has ever been permanently established where this type of religion prevails. It has ever been in league with despotism, and, at the present day, exhibits its affiliation with the lust of power. This naturally follows from the hierarchal system which it fosters. From the principle of authority in the church, it extends to a denial of all individual liberty. While conciliating the great and the proud by its gaudy ritual, it leaves the masses in undeveloped nature, and does but little to enlighten, invigorate, and quicken the mind into activity.

These are the fruits of the two systems of religious doctrine. They are not hung upon the tree like the sugar plum upon a Christmas bush. They are the natural fruits springing from the life of the tree. On the one hand, we have the natural development of the Protestant principle, that the Scriptures are the rule of faith. On the other hand, we have the development of an outward authority in the church. The contest has long been waged between these opposite systems, and we are now called upon in the Reformed church to decide between them. The contest changes its front and assumes modified forms. The controversy now going on in the church, is not a contest precisely as above stated, but the great question at stake is the same. Divested of subordinate issues, it comes to a choice between the two systems.

---

THERE are some who refuse a favor so graciously, as to please us even by the refusal; and there are others who confer an obligation so clumsily, that they please us less by the measure than they disgust us by the manner of a kindness, as puzzling to our feelings as the politeness of one who, if we had dropped our handkerchief, should present it unto us with a pair of tongs.—  
*Colton.*

THE GENERAL SYNOD AT CINCINNATI.

IN the outward organization of the Reformed church, upon the Scriptural basis, and according to the primitive Apostolic model of presbyterialism, its various functions for government, discipline, and the maintenance of needful order, have their bond of unity in a *General Synod*. Hence, in the language of the Constitution, "the General Synod represents the whole church. It is the highest judicatory of the church, and the last resort in all cases respecting the government of the church, not finally adjudicated by the (district) Synods."

"All changes in the ordinances of the church must be made by the General Synod." It "shall revise the proceedings of the (district) Synods, and approve or disapprove of their acts."

Being invested with this character, in relation to the whole church, and with the highest legislative, judicial and executive prerogatives, the general Synod is naturally and properly regarded by every true and devoted member of the church, as possessing the highest ecclesiastical interest. Its triennial assembly marks an occasion of importance proportioned to the wide extent of its jurisdiction, the final character of its decisions and acts, and their bearing upon the whole church. By it the common mind and spirit of the church are represented; and through it, as their voice, the will and the sentiments of the church are formally and constitutionally expressed. Whatever feelings of respect the lovers of order and respecters of properly exercised authority may cherish for any of the lower judicatories, will be correspondingly cherished for the General Synod in the fullest measure. Those who may go even so far as to consider the voice of a *subordinate* Synod the voice of God—as some profess to do, through a wrong interpretation of the promise of the Lord to be with his people always—will, of course, be pressed by every consistency, to accept and respect the utterances of a General Synod as eminently divine. And however strongly they may feel tempted to murmur or demur, should its decisions be contrary to their expectations and their desires, they will feel constrained to abide by the legitimate consequences of their own churchly creed or theory, and to bow with reverential acquiescence to whatever the church, through this chief member of its organic life, may determine or enjoin. In the judgment of those professing to hold such high views of the church and its



formal courts and assemblies, it may be thought a most grave and punishable offence to utter a word, or write a sentence, however true in itself, which may reflect unfavorably upon anything done by a lower judicatory. And any one who, not holding their views of the infallibility of ecclesiastical bodies, may allow himself to expose what is thought an error, or an act of injustice into which such bodies are believed to have fallen, and to criticise the action adversely, may be considered worthy of the severest censure, even by one of the lowest courts, or those swaying its decisions. How much more will they feel themselves restrained from indulging in offensively discourteous criticisms of the acts of the supreme judicatory of the church. If they hold that a lower Synod, to which they may immediately belong, is to be regarded with sentiments of respect which forbid even the thought of imputing to it a subserviency to improper influences, partisan passion, or motives unworthy of a professedly Christian body, much less will they permit any disappointment, dissatisfaction or chagrin, at the results reached by a General Synod, to tempt them to indulge in ill-natured and indecorous criticisms upon its deliberations and its acts. A theory or doctrine which may be warmly advocated with reference to a lower Synod, will, if honestly and sincerely entertained, be applied to that body which is declared constitutionally to represent the whole church.

The General Synod, which convened in the First Reformed church, (Rev. Kuelling's), in Cincinnati, on Wednesday evening, November 27th, and continued its sessions until Thursday evening of the following week, has, to say the least, equal claims with any which preceded it, upon respectful consideration and the cordial joy or acquiescence of the entire church. It represented interests as broad and as important as any other like convention. The attendance of delegates was as full, and the ability displayed in debate was quite as marked, as in the case of any previous General Synod. It was presided over with such manifest earnestness, equity and impartiality, that every candid observer must have been pleasantly impressed, and that no one could find the least fault! There was no changing of rules by the president to suit partisan purposes. With two or three slight exceptions, occasioned by the discomfiture of the minority at the failure of their measures, the deliberations of the Synod were conducted throughout with a measure of dignity and decorum which elicited the praise of the

secular press of the city. And questions were discussed and *settled* in an unequivocal, definite way, involving virtually the very gist and substance of points which had been previously left undetermined.

Altogether, therefore, it may be unhesitatingly affirmed, that the General Synod of Cincinnati possessed greater significance than any previous meeting of that body. The very fact that its deliberations and acts were less controversially theoretical, and hence less ambiguous, and that they concerned matters of more practical and effective importance, intensified its momentous significance. It may be safely asserted, that the results reached by the Synod, will give more satisfaction and pleasure to the large body of the church, so far as the people may fairly learn what was done, than those of either of Dayton in 1866, or of Philadelphia in 1869. And if those results are accepted in the right spirit, and followed by proper efforts, they cannot fail to secure for the church at large a measure of tranquility which has been, unhappily, unknown for years.

#### *The Organization*

of the Synod was effected by the choice, by acclamation, of the Rev. Prof. J. H. KLEIN, of Louisville, Kentucky, as President; and the Rev. J. H. Good, of Tiffin, Ohio, and the Rev. G. B. Russell, of Allegheny city, as Vice Presidents. The Rev. D. E. Klopp, of Philadelphia, was elected, by ballot, Corresponding Secretary; the other candidate being the Rev. J. S. Kieffer, of Hagerstown, Maryland.

As the Rev. Dr. Gerhart, the President of the previous Synod was detained by a wreck on the railroad, about fifty miles east of Columbus, the opening sermon was preached on Wednesday evening by Prof. Klein. His subject was, the First Synod in Jerusalem, (Acts 15: 7, 11,) and its lessons. The discourse was very happily suited to the occasion, and gave sincere satisfaction to all who heard it. Having been on the train which was delayed by the accident, we reached the church only in time to hear a few closing sentences.

In the appointment of the Standing and other Committees, the President proved his purpose to meet every reasonable expectation of impartiality implied in his unanimous election.



*Special Religious Services.*

As *Thursday*, November 28th, was set apart for the observance of a *National Thanksgiving*, the evening of that day was devoted by the Synod to appropriate services, many of the delegates uniting in those held in the First church, where a German and an English address were delivered; and others with those held in the Church of the Cross, where an English sermon was preached.

On *Friday* evening a *Home Mission* festival was held, at which interesting addresses were delivered by Rev. J. W. Steinmetz, of Danville, in English; and Rev. M. Bachman, of Baltimore, in German, to which the President of the General Board, Rev. Dr. Bausman, of Reading, added some stirring statements.

On Sunday, December 1st, the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the First church, and in the Church of the Cross. At the former, the Rev. Dr. Rust, of Tiffin, preached in German; and the Rev. G. B. Russell in English; at the latter, the sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Good, of Tiffin.

In the evening of the same day the Rev. Dr. Gerhart, of Lancaster, Pa., preached the sermon intended for the opening of the Synod. His subject was the *Gospel Ministry*, and in the treatment of it, the peculiar tenets of Mercersburg theology on the subject, seemed to be almost wholly avoided.

A half hour was set apart every morning, before the commencement of Synodical business, to devotional services.

It was most pleasantly refreshing to have the devotions of this Synod conducted throughout in accordance with the simple and yet edifying order and usage of the Reformed church.

*The Appeals.*

One of the distinctive doctrines of the Reformed church, as Evangelical Protestant, is the liability of ecclesiastical judicatories to err in their decisions and judgments. This doctrine is practically recognized in her Constitution. Accordingly, express provision is made for appeals, in certain cases, from the action of the lower courts, by which parties concerned may feel themselves aggrieved or wronged, to the judgment of the higher judicatory. This provision implies clearly three things: 1. That, from various causes, the lower courts may give occasion for grievance, by erroneous, unjust and injurious acts and judgments. 2. That

persons so wronged, or thinking themselves so wronged, ought to be afforded an opportunity of obtaining redress, by appeal to a superior tribunal. 3. That no lower judicatory should put hindrances in the way of the constitutional exercise of this right, or try by any trivial technicalities, or threatening assumptions of power, to prevent persons from availing themselves of this right of appeal, or to frustrate the equitable purpose of the Constitution in providing for such cases. 4. That persons appealing, are entitled to a fair, candid hearing; and, if they make out their case, to a reversal of the action of the lower judicatory, even though that judicatory should be the Eastern Synod.

Under existing circumstances, especially in the eastern portion of the church, it may not seem altogether strange that occasions for appeal should arise. The dominant party in the Eastern Synod, at present, hold a theory of the church and of church authority, so radically at variance with Reformed principles and practice, that the adherents of that party, and those who may be called its leaders, are peculiarly liable to false interpretations of the Constitution, and to a partial and oppressive application of their mistakes. Partisan zeal and personal hostilities growing out of such zeal, would, of course, increase this unfortunate liability. It requires more magnanimity, and a stronger sense of equity than human nature commonly cherishes or exhibits, for a party in power, and warmly intent upon carrying some favorite measure, to restrain itself from an abuse of that power, or to keep its exercise within the limits of justice and charity. The history of the past few years in the eastern section of our church, furnishes many illustrations of the fact, and some of them illustrations of a character calculated to cause hereafter, regret, or even shame. Instead, therefore, of surprise that any appeals should be made to the General Synod, it is rather to be wondered that there were not more of them.

Three cases demanded and received special attention. The first came up, as

*Prof. Super's Appeal.*

The occasion of it was the action of the Synod of Martinsburg in regard to the theological course of instruction in Ursinus College. Not having been present at said Synod, the action was taken under circumstances which made it impossible for us to avail



ourselves of the protection of the Constitution in the case, although one part of the action was a virtual judgment of censure passed upon us personally. But as Prof. Super's relation to Ursinus College, and to ourselves, was immediate and personal, the action involved him so far as fully to justify him in regarding it as a personal grievance, and gave him a right to appeal from it. His claim to do so was, indeed, denied at Martinsburg, and thus an attempt was made to shut us out from the only chance of redress. But by persisting in his right he carried the point, and those who had been betrayed into the mistaken action, were compelled so far to a revision and readjudication of the procedure by the higher court.

As the paper adopted in the case by the Eastern Synod was published in our November issue, it will suffice to refer to it as found on pp. 626-7.

The appeal having been found in order by the Committee to whom the papers were referred, the hearing of the case was made the order of the day for Monday, December 2d, 10 a. m. Fifty minutes were allowed to each side, the appellant having twenty minutes to open the case, the respondents fifty for their argument, and then the appellant thirty in reply. In the absence of Prof. Super, the duty of supporting the appeal fell by his request to our lot. The respondent on the Martinsburg Synod's side were, Rev. Dr. Higbee, of Mercersburg, Elder C. M. Bousch, esq., of Erie; and Rev. Dr. Gerhart. Dr. Gerhart was put in Rev. T. G. Apple's place, who had been appointed on the defence, but did not get back from a visit to some neighboring town in time to take part.

As the substance of the argument presented in support of the appeal is contained in the following reasons for it, which were lodged with the President of the Eastern Synod, they are given instead of an attempted sketch of the remarks made.

URSINUS COLLEGE, FREELAND, }  
Montgomery, co., Pa., Oct. 30, 1872. }

*To the Rev. M. A. Smith, President of the Synod of the Reformed church in the United States:*

Rev. and Dear Brother: In accordance with the Constitution of the Reformed church, I herewith furnish you with the grounds or reasons of my appeal from the action of the late Synod of Martinsburg, in regard to teachers of theology, and the Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D.

First. The action assumes and rests upon an interpretation of the Constitution in regard to the points in question and disposed of, which is unwarranted by the letter and spirit of the Constitution, contrary to long sanctioned usage, and prejudicial to common rights, never surrendered by the church.

Secondly. By its action the Synod has transcended its constitutional powers, usurped unlawful jurisdiction, put contempt without cause or excuse upon a Classis, and violated private rights in a manner at once arbitrary and tyrannical, and tending to jeopardize the liberty, reputation and office of every minister and member of that portion of the church within its jurisdiction.

Thirdly. By openly arraigning, convicting, and imposing a penalty of censure upon Dr. Bomberger, in his absence, without previous notice, and without affording him the least opportunity of defence or appeal, the Synod has disregarded one of the plainest provisions of the Constitution of the church, violated a most common and vital principle of equity and justice, and inflicted a cruel personal wrong.

Fourth. Because, in consideration of the official relation of Dr. Bomberger, the party thus unjustly dealt with, to Ursinus College, the Synod, by its action, has attempted to fix a stigma upon said college, to injure its growing prosperity, and hinder its usefulness as a Reformed educational institution, and thus has wronged not only Dr. Bomberger, but the Faculty, the Board of Directors, and numerous friends of Ursinus College, and sought violently to crush the principles they represent.

And, finally, because all this has been done in utter disregard and defiance of the solemn compact of the General Synod of Philadelphia, 1869, by which the same rights and protection were guaranteed to those whose position and principles are represented by Ursinus College, as to those who maintain opposite views, and represent a different theological and ecclesiastical tendency.

Yours, very respectfully.

Besides the points included in these reasons, two or three others were noticed in reply to statements made by the defendants of the Eastern Synod. 1. In refutation of an effort to have the appeal ruled out, on the ground that Prof. Super had no direct personal concern in the action of the Eastern Synod, it was maintained that he had such interest in that action: First, as Professor in the College whose interests the action assailed; secondly, as a



member of the Classis whose primary jurisdiction the Eastern Synod had disregarded; thirdly, as a friend and partner of the individual whom that Synod's action had condemned without a hearing, and in his absence; and fourthly, because the action of the Eastern Synod in the case, exposed him (Prof. S.) personally, and every other brother who might become obnoxious to a majority in said Synod, to a similar act of injustice and oppression.

2. Another special point made, was called forth by a statement of the other side, to the effect that in giving theological instruction in Ursinus College, we had privately assumed and arrogated the office of a theological professor, &c. In reply, the facts were stated—first, that Ursinus College had not been originated or founded by us, but by a number of members of the church, (ministers and elders for the most part), who had felt the necessity of establishing an institution which should be conducted upon strictly Reformed principles, and that it was only after much hesitation that we yielded to the pressure of the proposed movement. Secondly, that the Theological Department in the college was opened, under the privileges of its charter, by the Board of Directors. And thirdly, that any services which we may be rendering in that department, are rendered in compliance with the appointment and request of said Board of Directors.\*

The *respondents*, in their attempt to vindicate the Eastern Synod against the grounds taken in the appeal, relied mainly upon two points.

1. An effort was made to show that as an *appeal*, it could not be properly entertained by the Synod, inasmuch as Prof. Super was not (by their assumption) *personally* affected by the Martinsburg action. It was urged that his only constitutional relief, was to bring the matter before the General Synod in the way of *complaint*. Because of this mistake of the appellant, his case should be dismissed.

In regard to that item in the appeal which refers to the Eastern Synod's unconstitutional assumption of primary jurisdiction by its action against a member of the Classis of Philadelphia, without having the matter first brought before that Classis, it was claimed

---

\*No notice would have been taken of this and similar attempts to substitute odious personalities for the lack of honest and manly arguments, were it not due to our friends to let them know the facts of the case, with which to enable them to meet and repel calumnious insinuations.

that the action of the Eastern Synod was not judicial, and did not possess the nature of a sentence and a penalty, but amounted simply to a charge, or an indictment, to be subsequently prosecuted in case the person concerned should not desist from the alleged offence, (giving theological instruction.)

This, as well as we remember, was the substance of Elder Bousch's argument, and clearly shows the mind and tact of a lawyer. Only, as we suggested privately to our esteemed friend Bousch, the difficulties of maintaining the points made were, under the circumstances, more than a match even for his legal ability and skill. The first point was plainly a mere a technical quibble, unwarranted, as has been shown by the facts in the case. As to the other, if the action of the Martinsburg Synod did not amount to a condemnation without a trial, and to a penalty without the least chance of self-defence, it was utterly foolish and void in itself.

2. The burden of Dr. Higbee's response, so far as we are able to give it from memory and two or three scanty notes, involved two points. First, he endeavored, on the assumption that we and our associates in the Faculty of Ursinus College were performing the functions of professors of theology, to show that to do this, without having been duly elected and invested with the office by a Synod, was unconstitutional, subversive of proper church order, and mischievous in its effects. That, consequently, the Eastern Synod was justified in its action, and that therefore the appeal should not be sustained.

Dr. Gerhart declined to occupy the few minutes which were left after the counsel for the appeal and the two respondents had finished their remarks, preferring to reserve what he had to say for the general discussion of the case by the Synod at large, each member being allowed ten minutes for this purpose, by the arrangement. As the hour of adjournment had arrived when the counsel on both sides closed, the general discussion was reserved for the afternoon session.

The entire session was occupied with the case. Some thirty members took part in it, nearly an equal number on both sides.

Among the speakers in defence of the Eastern Synod, were Drs. Gerhart, Bossard, of Sheboygan, T. G. Apple (if we mistake not), Revs. J. S. Kieffer, I. K. Loos, and Elders Zahm, of Lancaster, and Seibert, of Harrisburg. The most forcible remarks, in our judgment, and altogether the best argument presented on this



side of the question, were those made by our young brother Kieffer, of Hagerstown.

In favor of the case presented by the appeal, we remember Drs. Williard, Winters, Good, G. W. Welker and E. H. Nevin, Revs. P. Greding, Dieckman, Toensmeier, Wanner and Schiller, and Elders Mueller and Wiest.

On taking the vote, after the discussion, the appeal was sustained by 100 yeas against 78 nays. Seven of the delegates having been members of the Martinsburg Synod, had not voted in the case. But as we have learned that at least two of these seven would have voted with the majority, the result would have been changed by the addition of only three more nays, (102 yeas to 83 nays.) As it was, it may seem fairly questionable whether, in equity, any delegates from the Eastern Synod should have been allowed to vote, on the ground of their direct personal interest in the case.

After the result was announced the minority were evidently disturbed in their feelings, and desired to do something to break the moral force of the decision, yet without knowing precisely what. So one of their number, (Dr. Higbee or Dr. Apple), moved that a special committee be appointed to draft a paper, setting forth definitely the import or sense of the decision reached, as to the particular points covered by the decision, and which should be formally communicated to the Eastern Synod.

The majority was, of course, not only willing, but glad to have this done, and the motion was unanimously adopted. This committee, through its chairman, Rev. D. Van Horn, of Dayton, reported (on Wednesday) as follows:

1. That the General Synod has decided that the conduct of Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., and those associated with him in Ursinus College, in giving theological instruction at the request of the Board of Directors, is not disorderly, nor contrary to the Constitution of the Reformed church.

2. That the General Synod has decided that the Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States acted unconstitutionally in assuming original jurisdiction in the case of one of the ministers of the Classis of Philadelphia.

Rev. Dr. Apple, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, introduced the following amendment to the report of the committee:

"Although they have not been invested with the office of

teacher of theology, nor conduct their theological teachings under the direction of the Eastern Synod."

As this amendment (whatever may have been intended by it,) was believed to give additional importance and force to the resolutions proposed by the committee, it was unanimously adopted, and the report as thus amended was adopted. In voting upon it, however, the minority felt the incongruity of *their* voting as to what was the sense of the Synod as expressed through the majority, in the action taken on the appeal. Hence, quite a number of them, after Dr. Apple had set the example, desired to be excused from voting, and of course their request was granted.

Thus ended this first appeal, so far as a formal decision upon it was concerned.

In order to give space to the following excellent article from the pen of Professor Super, and which has just been handed in, our notice of other important items is postponed to February. So, for the present, we conclude with a few reflections suggested by the brief history and the result of this first appeal.

1. It fairly involved, and was felt to involve, the vital issue joined by the Reformed church with the high-church, ritualistic Mercersburg theology, or Nevinism, of the Eastern Synod. And this was the first time that an opportunity was had of meeting the ritualistic innovation in a square way and in a definitely tangible form. At Dayton and at Philadelphia, the new-order party evaded a positive collision under plausible and ambiguous pleas for toleration, or deceptive concessions, which they afterwards interpreted to suit themselves. In this appeal case there was no chance for such evasion. They felt this. Hence their desire to have the appeal quashed, to prevent the case being tried on its intrinsic merits, and escape the dilemma into which an incautious betrayal of their principles and plans, by an overt act of the Martinsburg Synod, had thrust them. As this point is discussed by Prof. Super, we need add no more.

2. The great significance of the success of the appeal, and of the endorsement of the chief grounds of it by the General Synod, is manifest. This is proven by its obviously crushing effect upon those who were most zealous in seeking to defeat it. They knew what the action of the Martinsburg battery meant. That action was aimed only ostensibly at an individual; really it contemplated the utter annihilation of the Reformed cause in the east. And



now that the scheme has so signally failed, it is as idle as it is silly, to attempt to disparage the bearing of what the General Synod did. In supporting the appeal, Synod declared against high-churchism, and in favor of the old historical principles of the Reformed church. And this was done understandingly.

3. For the happy result thus achieved, the church is largely indebted to the firm and intelligent fidelity of our German brethren to the faith and principles of the Reformed church. Great efforts were probably made both before and during the meeting of the Synod, to sway their vote in favor of the Eastern Synod's party, by such specious arguments and persuasions as are sometimes employed in such cases. On this point we prefer to say no more. But they were firm and immovable, as they always are, when afforded a fair opportunity of learning the merits of a case. By this fidelity they have repaid ten-fold all that has ever been done (and it has never been anything for Dr. A. or *his* side to boast of) to aid them, and that not for themselves personally, but aid them in serving the cause of Christ in our church in the West.

How unjust, therefore, for Dr. Apple to assail them as he has done in the *Reformed Church Messenger*; and in that *Messenger*, as under Dr. Fisher's control, to allow them to be assailed, as has been recently allowed, in an article full of the gall of bitterness and venomous vituperation.

Our German brethren have as good a right to their convictions, and the free, untrammelled expression of them, as new-order partisans have to theirs. And however angrily Dr. Apple and the *Messenger* may denounce them, the church which they have been and are now so faithfully serving, under many self-denials and heavy personal burdens, will know how to hold them in grateful remembrance.

For other reflections suggested by the action on this particular appeal case, we again refer the reader to the able article subjoined. If space allows, extracts from Dr. Apple's unhappy article will be given under our *Editors' Desk*.

---

WE should not retain the remembrance of faults we have once forgiven.

## EASTERN SYNOD vs. GENERAL SYNOD.

IN the action of the late Synod of Martinsburg, Va., constitutional points were involved which are as important to the church as the ends designed to be accomplished by the measures which involved these points. As the battle has been fought on a field to which both parties summoned their chief forces available for it, and for which preparation had been made for some time previously, and especially since the meeting of the Eastern Synod, and as the wind is driving away slowly the mass of smoke and revealing the field with its wrecks and wounded victims of the carnage, the latter fortunately figurative, as no hairs were singed nor heads broken, we are enabled to take a calmer view of the situation, and to consider the results of the action from a more distant and therefore more comprehensive point of observation.

At the Synod at Martinsburg, in the action in regard to teachers of theology, one of the chief points involved the relation of ministers to Synod, and the position was taken that if a minister should teach theology to students, such teaching caused the minister to assume the office of teacher of theology, and by this act rendered himself amenable to Synod. The Constitution is clear in giving jurisdiction to Synod over such "Theological Seminaries as it may establish or maintain within its bounds." "The professors in such institutions shall be amenable only to the Synod to which they may respectively belong." But this very exception proves the rule, that all others who are not professors in a Theological Seminary *established by Synod*, are not amenable to Synod, and occupy the position of all other ministers who are amenable to a Classis in the first place as the lower judicatory through which the action must pass before it can appear in a legal way before the Synod. It was pronounced disorderly for a minister to give instruction to theological students, because this was virtually assuming the office of teacher of theology. In opposition to this, it was maintained that a minister can give instruction to students in theology without becoming by that fact a professor in a Theological Seminary under the care of Synod, or a teacher of theology in the technical sense of the Constitution: that such instruction has always been given by ministers throughout the church, and that the Constitution did not confine licensure to such students who prepared under teachers of theology in the tech-



nical sense, but allowed it to all who were properly qualified for the position, of which qualification the ecclesiastical judicatories must be the judges, and therefore to those who prepared under the instruction of ministers in the ordinary sense, and that such candidates have always been received and ordained. On this issue parties divided; notice of appeal was given and the case carried up to the General Synod.

The action of the General Synod at its meeting in Cincinnati, is now before the church. What was the view it held in relation to the jurisdiction of a district Synod over a minister not elected by it to the position of a teacher of theology? The deliverance of the General Synod on this particular point, is as follows: "Resolved, That the (district) Synod of the United States acted unconstitutionally in assuming original jurisdiction in the case of one of the ministers of the Philadelphia Classis."

A more important resolution than this was not passed by the General Synod, for it confirmed the ancient liberty of the Reformed churches as exhibited in the Constitutions of the Reformed churches from Calvin's time onward, and which had such an important bearing on the liberties of England and on the civil courts of England and the United States. It is a *réecho* of the old spirit, and declares that jurisdiction holds not from the higher to the lower in the way of an outward authority dispensed by a vice-regent of Christ with whom it was lodged; but from below upward, as derived from the universal priesthood of believers. It re-affirms that ecclesiastical authority comes not from a Pope or Bishop, but from the people of the Lord.

Another point involved in the action of the Eastern Synod, was the difference between a complaint and an appeal. The constitution provides two ways of carrying up an action from a lower to a higher judicatory. It declares "that any one thinking himself aggrieved by a decision of Synod may appeal," and it provides that "Any member or members who have voted in the minority in a decision which they conceive affecting the Constitution of the church or the interests of religion, or any person or persons being members of the church, shall be permitted to carry up such a decision to a higher judicatory by way of complaint, etc." It also affirms that "The necessary effect of an appeal, is to stay the execution of a sentence."

From this it was held that on points affecting the Constitution

of the church, a case must go up to the higher judicatory by way of complaint. This, however, is not so clear when taken in connection with other articles of the Constitution. Article 37 says, "In order to prevent vexation and delay in the judicial proceedings of any ecclesiastical assembly by means of successive appeals in the progress of any trial or investigation, the party who may consider himself aggrieved by any decision, upon any incidental question which may arise before a final sentence is pronounced, may state his objections to such decision, and require to have the same noted in the minutes of the proceedings, to the end that he may avail himself thereof on an appeal from the final sentence, without arresting the progress of such investigation or trial." Here successive appeals in the progress of a trial are contemplated, and the vexation and delay likely to arise from them, provided against. From this we must infer, that such appeals are not objectionable except on account of the delay which they may cause in a trial. It is the delay and not the appeal itself which is provided against. These appeals are on "incidental questions," and these incidental questions come up in the course of a trial before the final sentence is pronounced. It is difficult to conceive of such incidental questions coming up in the course of a trial without including in them constitutional points. We conclude, therefore, that appeals on constitutional points are allowable. It is remarkable also that Art. 61, in defining the powers of a Synod, says, "It may receive and determine appeals from Classis," but says nothing about complaints.

Two cases came before the Eastern Synod in which this point was involved. As the objection to an appeal was the same in both cases, to save time and delay only one of these was tested before the General Synod. In the resolutions on teachers of theology, charges of disorder were brought against a minister who was not present to defend himself, and a committee was appointed to require him to desist from the disorder of which the resolutions assumed him to be guilty. Here there was something very like a sentence to be executed, injurious to the character of a minister and to the institution over which he presided. It was important to secure a stay of proceedings until an investigation could be had. The necessary effect of an appeal is, to stay the execution of a sentence; but such is not the effect of a complaint. An appeal was taken, but it was ruled out of order, on the ground that the



appellant was not a party in the case, and that therefore it affected a constitutional point and must go up by way of complaint. The Eastern Synod also assumed that the form which the case assumes, must be determined by the lower court. This, however, if granted, would in some cases place it in the power of a lower court to refuse an appeal altogether. On both of these positions the lower court was overruled by the General Synod. It pronounced the appeal, which the lower court refused, to be in order. It therefore determined the form which the case should take, and determined that it was an appeal, and not a complaint.

A third important constitutional point determined, was the right of ministers to teach theology to students without a formal inauguration into the office called teacher of theology. This is as it should be. The office of the minister, of divine origin, is above any constitutional device. The design of the office of the ministry, is to teach theology; and to confine such teaching to a particular class, or to exclude such right of teaching from a particular class, is to limit the office of the ministry. Every minister is free to teach theology to students, if he can get them. There need be no fear that this will interfere with Theological Seminaries. The same necessity which led to their establishment, will continue to lead students to take advantage of the facilities which they offer to obtain a theological education. Ministers cannot usually spare the time to instruct students, and are not disposed to add to their labors, except under special cases. Eminent lawyers and doctors receive students to read law or medicine in their offices, but this does not do away with law and medical departments in Universities. It rather adds to the fuller equipment of the profession and to a better preparation on the part of the student.

A fourth point settled, was the right of a congregation, through its consistory, to designate the direction which benevolent funds shall take without interference from the Classis. The General Synod has declared that "No judicatory has the right to alienate any funds from the purposes for which they were contributed, but that consistories have the undoubted right to designate the direction which benevolent funds in their hands shall take when not specially designated by the donor."

These several points are important, as expressing the views of the highest judicatory of the church, especially in view of the ac-

tion taken by the same Synod looking to the formation of a new Constitution. The committees of the district Synods having this in charge, have an expression on the most vital points involved in the Constitution for their guidance. They must conform to the views of the General Synod, or their work will not be accepted by the Classes to which their work will be finally referred.

In the new Constitution, it is now clear, the office of "teacher of theology" should not appear. It is without warrant in Scripture and is not recognized in the practice of the church as conferring any special right in the instruction of students in theology. It should be distinctly stated in the new Constitution, that candidates for the ministry may prepare either at a theological seminary or under the direction and instruction of a minister of the gospel. This will prevent any misconception hereafter. The articles on appeals and complaints should be thoroughly revised, and the right of appeal on all decisions of a judicatory, clearly stated. The action of complaint might as well be abolished, as a stay of proceedings is as much needed on points of law as on criminal trials, for general interests are often involved in the former, of greater importance than individual cases in the latter.

The whole contest, however, assumed the importance we have ascribed to it in consequence of the interests involved, and which were behind the action and debates of the General Synod. The struggle was mainly over constitutional points, and questions of theology involving the merits of the two tendencies, were kept in abeyance. This was perhaps done to avoid any acerbity that might possibly have been engendered by the introduction of theological questions at this time, by the great length of the debates on such questions should they be introduced, and because these theological points have been discussed largely elsewhere. But notwithstanding this, every one knew that the real contest was over Nevinism. There was not a single person in or out of the Synod, acquainted with the facts, but knew that the constitutional points assumed importance from their relation to the two tendencies. A crisis, in fact, had been reached, and on the decision of these constitutional points one or the other party must fall.

Up to a certain point, the ritualistic party asked simply for toleration. They wished merely to introduce the Order of Worship as a trial. They asked only to be allowed to test its use, in congregations perfectly willing to receive it. In this Trojan horse,



however, were concealed all the main points of a theological system. The Order of Worship derives its significance from the system of theology on which it is based, and incorporated this system when it was in its ripened state. The centre of radiation of the new system, was in the bounds of the Eastern Synod. In its distribution, the results were, of course, to be found chiefly in this Synod. After gaining strength, however, the ritualistic party assumed a cōordinate rank, but still professed to allow all the rights and privileges which they enjoyed, to the other side. One of their chief writers was chairman of the committee of the General Synod of 1869, which declared that "the only possible course is, to allow the question to work out its results in a free way; and therefore no trammels should be put upon the matter in any direction." Advances, however, were made, and it was claimed that the minister, and not the consistory, must decide the question of worship in a congregation.

The intentions of the party, however, were never so clearly revealed as at the meeting of Synod at Martinsburg, Virginia, where the future policy displayed itself in unmistakable form. It thought itself sufficiently strong to strike out in the policy of conquest. Its confident assurance manifested itself in repeated ways; and in the report on the state of religion it was asserted, that "Our late doctrinal conflict is virtually passed, so far as this Synod is concerned, and we have settled down in the unity of one faith." "With us the question in regard to cultus, is settled in principle; and we hope only to advance to the full apprehension and practical application of the divine idea, now clothed for us in what we believe to be a proper form, as an Order of Worship for our church." This assertion was made in the face of the fact, that very few congregations had introduced the New Order of Worship in full. Not one-tenth of the ministers of that party dared to use in full, the regular Sunday morning and evening service in their congregations; and the remainder placed themselves in the miserable plight of a conflict between their preferences and convictions on the one hand, and their fears of their congregations on the other. But they imagined that, as power was now in their hands, they could exterminate all opposition. They had gained the majority in a number of the Classes and packed the Synod. It was fortunate that the party allowed itself to be provoked into a display of its designs. It has given us an ample foretaste of what

it will do when it has the power. The centre of distribution of New Order men, was and is the theological Seminary at Lancaster. From this had gone forth the members who had swelled the ranks of the New Order party in the ministry. They were not content with this, and determined that the Seminary should enjoy the monopoly of preparing all the ministers in the bounds of the Eastern Synod. Could they do this, it was evident that their triumph, so far as the ministry was concerned, was only a question of time. Whether the congregations could maintain themselves under the change of worship from the defections likely to follow, is another question. They now determined to cut off the old Reformed side from the possibility of any increase in the ranks of its ministry. The ministers of that side, often brow-beaten in the Classis which had a majority of ritualists, could only linger on until the way might be opened for New Order men to take their places, who, prudently at first, would not be extremists; but no increase in the number on that side must, by any possibility, be allowed. The old Reformed party, feeling the necessity of protecting themselves from such a result, established an Institution for the education of young men, and connected with it a theological department, not under the care of the Eastern Synod, but still in charge of members and ministers of the Reformed church; and enjoying the approval of an entire Classis, and of many ministers outside of that Classis. It occupies this somewhat anomalous position not from choice, but because, if placed under the care of the Eastern Synod, the majority must choose the professors, and it must become the tool of the ritualists. The majority saw the obstacles placed in the way of their plans, and they made a desperate effort to get rid of it. Should they even crush Ursinus College, however, there might be another way whereby ministers of the old Reformed side could be sent forth. The right of preparation under individual ministers has, in practice, always been granted, and in this way students might be sent into the ministry. The Eastern Synod determined to cut off this chance also, and passed a resolution, forbidding any minister to give instruction to students, except by a special permission of Synod. In this way they hoped to sweep the field. The plan of the ritualists exhibits such a want of generosity to the other side, that we cannot account for it, only on the ground of a conscious fear and desperation in their position, or from the spirit of ecclesiastical absolutism which seems



inseparable from their views. Perhaps there was a mingling of both in their designs.

To their surprise, no doubt, they found the church at large unprepared to follow them in their crusade. Before the General Synod, they met with a defeat and strong rebuke. The Reformed church has shown itself true to the Reformation, and to the old type of Protestantism prevalent in the church before the advent of Nevinism. It can see no necessity to go back of the Reformation in doctrine or cultus. It has refused to sustain a party which had brought forward a system which, in their estimation, must reconcile all periods in the church, and even harmonize Romanism and Protestantism. Fine as the design originally appeared, it has long since been seen to be a failure. Prominent men of the party, in despair went over to Romanism. Even their leader, Dr. J. W. Nevin, gave up hope; and in 1869, in the *Reformed Church Messenger*, advised his party to abandon the attempt as impracticable. The party would have done well had they followed his advice. They refused to listen to their leader, and the subordinates went forward determined to prevail. The party, called together by the voice of their leader, followed his standard eagerly, as he ordered the advance; but they refused to obey when he sounded a retreat. The champion, who appeared in the columns of the *Messenger* to urge on the ranks in spite of the advice of Dr. Nevin, was the leader set up to put through the measures, both at the Eastern and General Synod. His ignominious defeat will enable the party to estimate the relative value of the contrary counsels given.

That party ought now to see the difficulty of their undertaking, and quietly to allow the movement to die out. We must not suppose, however, that such a flattering hope can be safely indulged. They have marched forward with the spirit of crusaders, and the frenzy which has seized them cannot be so easily abated. It must be evident now, however, that in spite of all they may do, both parties are in a position to carry on the contest indefinitely, with the prospects largely against the Nevinites. The effect, then, must be simply to divide the church into two parties with constant bitterness and contention. The harmony of our ecclesiastical meetings, once attended with pleasure, turned into discord and jangling; instead of union, the prospect exhibited of two sects, where before there was one denomination. Is this to be the last

result of the Mercersburg theology? Are its high aims to collapse in simply increasing the misery of our "variegated Israel." We cannot believe that the inventor or compiler of the system ever contemplated such a mournful result. The leaders of the movement cannot feel happy in the view of such a cheerless issue. Better then to hold on to the old foundations. They have served us for three centuries. They will serve us for many centuries more.

H. W. S.

---

#### FACTS, VERSUS BOASTING.

THE excellent articles on "Facts versus Boasting," in the November and December numbers of the *Reformed Monthly*, are to the point, as every one well-informed in regard to the state of the Reformed church must know. It has been a matter of the greatest surprise to many, that we still hear at Synods, and in the *Messenger*, that the New Order theology and ritual are carrying everything before them; when the fact is patent, that the church has substantially rejected them, and their total dying out is now only a question of time.

In addition to the contradictory statements contained in adopted reports of the Martinsburg Synod, noticed in the *Monthly for Nov.*, p. 693, and which are curiously characteristic in this way, we have been reminded of a remarkable passage in Dr. Gerhart's report to the General Synod at Cincinnati on the state of the church. He says:

"In conclusion, the committee feel constrained to make explicit reference to the difference of sentiment touching worship, and some points of doctrine, that prevail in the Reformed church. That there are two tendencies was distinctly recognized by the General Synod of Philadelphia. This division of sentiment has ripened into antagonism, the adherents of one tendency being arrayed in their practical church work directly against the adherents of the opposite tendency. Whilst the present state of things exists there can be no unity, peace and concord. Instead of concentrating our energies in the way of harmonious action against the common foe, much of our time and strength is expended in



maintaining the conflict within our own organization, and in seeking to achieve victory ; one tendency a victory over the other. What is to be done ? The status is abnormal."

This passage suggests some reflections. 1. The Reformed church is *not united* on the ritualism and doctrinal system of Mercersburg, notwithstanding all the boasting of this school ; but is, by a large majority, decidedly opposed to the same. The system, if such it can be called, has been tried, weighed in the balance, and been found wanting. A brighter era is about to dawn upon the Reformed church, since the moderate but decided and manly action of the General Synod of Cincinnati.

2. If these divisions exist, as Dr. G. *now* confesses and realizingly feels, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SAME ? Who produced them ? Who brought in the gravest innovations, in doctrine and practice, against the most earnest remonstrances and warnings ? Who attempted by ecclesiastical power to force the same upon an unwilling church ? Who cherished and protected the teachings that led Wolff, Ermentrout and others, into the Catholic church ; and Giesy, Hartman & Co., into high-church episcopacy ?

*Impartial history has already recorded, that it was the Mercersburg school, of which Dr. G. is a prominent member.*

3. A solemn duty now rests upon the church. As speedily as possible the "root of bitterness" should be cast out of the church. We should all agree to continue to stand upon the substantial basis of the historical doctrines and practices of the Reformed church. Then we shall have peace.

OLEVIANUS.

---

Do thy part with industry, and leave the event with God. I have seen matters fall out so unexpectedly, that they have taught me in all affairs neither to despair nor to presume ; not to despair, for God can help ; not to presume, for God can cross me. I will never despair, because I have a God ; I will never presume, because I am but a man.—*Feltham.*

## Ursinus College Repertory.

### URSINUS COLLEGE REPERTORY.

It will doubtless be as gratifying to our readers as it is to ourselves, to find the Repertory department of the *Monthly* for this first number of the new year, so well supplied with articles furnished by the students of the College. One of the chief designs in opening this department, was to afford our young men an opportunity of exercising their gifts in this way. The advantages of this must be manifest. Not only will students be thus stimulated to a laudable emulation among themselves in the use of their pens, to a practical application of what they have learned, and to an easy and natural self-possession in such public efforts, but their friends and the friends of the Institution can see what our young men are doing, note the ruling current of their thoughts, and mark the progress they are making.

The anniversaries of the Societies, and other public College occasions, furnish special opportunities for this, and it will give us pleasure from time to time to publish the addresses delivered in connection with such festivities.

In the present case, the anniversary of the *Schaff Society* has supplied the material. A visiting friend has kindly contributed an account of its exercises, and pleasantly reports his impressions.

---

### THE SCHAFF LITERARY SOCIETY.

#### *Its First Anniversary.*

A HAPPY streak of fortune brought us to the first anniversary of this juvenile candidate for popular favor. Youthful as the mother Institution is known to be, we expected the still more youthful



daughter to entertain us youthfully for the evening, nothing more, and were most agreeably surprised to find the new and commodious College hall tastefully and elegantly decorated, and every necessary preparation at hand to entertain, edify, and elevate those who might be in attendance. On occasions of this nature, the labor very often devolves upon a few; but the ladies, always ready to further a laudable undertaking, extended a liberal, helping hand; and to their taste and judgment the young gentlemen doubtless are willing to ascribe a great measure of their success. But details would be tedious.

The exercises proper, were opened with prayer by Rev. Dr. Kremer, of Lebanon, in whose mild, yet truly solemn style, the blessings of Almighty God were invoked upon the College, its faculty and students.

To present a critical review of each performance, and to contrast its manly merits with its youthful blemishes, would be a pleasant and entertaining exercise, but one that would extend these notes beyond their contemplated proportions.

Salutatories, like the old-fashioned fire-tongs, are necessarily bodiless entities, yet essentially indispensable until progress and invention shall enrich the future with a substitute. On the present occasion, however, there was no need to regret the old order of things. The audience were welcomed in a brief, yet as chaste and apposite a discourse, as we have listened to in a long time. Specially were we pleased with the kind allusions to the sister, or more properly, the mother Society, from which this youthful organization, Minerva-like, sprung one short year ago. Generous rivalry has its advantages, and if conducted with proper spirit, acts as a wholesome stimulant, and should be encouraged rather than discouraged among young men preparing themselves for the great moral conflict now abroad in the world. But we wish to avoid contrasts and invidious distinctions. With all our senses awake to catch something upon which to base a criticism, it would be strange enough if we could not arraign some gesture, except to some enunciation, or impeach some dash at oratory; yet aggregating the occasion, we consider the positive merits of the several performances equal to similar efforts of older and more experienced hands, and justly entitled to the unreserved approbation of the large and attentive audience. The chaste style of composition, the appropriate illustrations, and the comprehensiveness and per-

spicuity of thoughts, evinced diligence and care which augur well for the future, and reflect great honor upon the Faculty of Ursinus. Such auspicious beginnings afford encouragements for a future of more than ordinary brightness, and we here express our hope, that no energies will be spared on the part of the young men to reach the topmost round. Let the sentiment of your classic yet unassuming motto, remain green in your heart of hearts, and nerve you to deeds of noblest daring. Intelligence and virtue are known to be the conservative elements of self-government. They spread their fostering wings over the rising genius of civilization, nurture institutions of learning, and are the patrons of correct principles. Monarchs may have the whole of their reign crowded with enterprises of earthly glory; their vassaled millions may bow with humble adoration before their thrones; the expanse of their domain, or the wisdom of their councils may win the favor of admiring potentates, yet one act of modest, unobtrusive virtue, would eclipse the renown of all their public deeds.

The Ursinus orchestra was present and lent charms to the occasion, by discoursing in sweetest strains some of its favorite melodies.

The entire programme was a decided success, of which the patron saint of the Society himself might justly feel proud.

P. W.

---

#### PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

It is conceded among the learned, that the nineteenth century is far in advance of any period of the world, in the spread of light and knowledge. The arts have flourished, the sciences have multiplied, learning has advanced, and the Gospel of Jesus Christ is preached, as it were, from every house-top, and street, and by-way, in every civilized country on the globe. Through entire empires the Bible is read more than any other book. Freedom of conscience has, in some cases, been established by the Constitution of the state, in countries where it was previously suppressed. Yet amidst all this blaze of light, suddenly arises one of the darkest and most stupendous claims ever made by mortal man—that of the infallibility of the Pope.



The Pope, or Bishop of Rome, who, as the assumed Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole church here below, presumes to represent the divinity on earth, arrogates spiritual and temporal power and dominion over her, and is called, by way of eminence, His Holiness, or the Holy Father. This person is held as her lawful head, by the church commonly known as the Roman Catholic, which claims that infallibility dwells exclusively within her precincts. In the earlier centuries, a council with Pope at its head, was considered inerrable; soon afterwards the Pope was declared to possess unlimited sovereignty; and on the 18th of July, 1870, it was decreed by a small number of prelates, that he is infallible—an act, the declaration of which, was accompanied by a terrible thunder-storm, of which, it is written, that “the lightning flashed and the thunder pealed as we have not heard at this season before.”

The ground on which this doctrine is maintained, may be summed up in a few simple statements. Christ, established in the person of the Apostle, St. Peter, a spiritual monarch, who represented Him in the church at Rome, and whom the bishops of that city succeeded. He appointed a successor, who, through the act of consecration, received his prerogatives, the same right of exercising supreme power, and was made worthy of equal adoration. Thus a long chain was begun to be forged, starting at the foot of an Apostle, which has been stretched out until it now extends to the present Pope Pius IX, with whom it seems doubtful that he will be able to add another link to the crumbling chain, without the aid of Vulcan himself or some of his disciples. To the first link was imparted a mysterious and subtle virtue, which has been transmitted by successive consecrations from age to age: It is a supernatural office, placed upon them independently of their persons, so that should they become dead members of the church by sin, may pollute themselves by crimes and vice, they may yet remain the instruments of the Holy Ghost, who is claimed to speak by them.

But can we assent to these claims? No; for the church of Rome itself is divided on this subject. Some of her most learned divines deny the truth of the entire theory, notwithstanding she loudly boasts of perfect unity. Serious contentions have often arisen among her leading men concerning this vital doctrine, councils appealing from the decision of Popes, formally condemn-

ing what they had decided by their infallible knowledge and by the authority of St. Peter, contradicting each other in their testimony of the truth, which would not have taken place had the Holy Spirit spoken by the Pope. It has also been clearly proven, that the Son of God did not establish in the person of Peter, a spiritual monarch, head over all in the church, who performs his functions on earth; for the key of heavenly power is in the hands of "Him that hath the key of David," and who "will not give His glory to another." Neither was it to Peter alone, but to the *twelve* that the Lord gave the power of absolving or of condemning; and that through His word, and not otherwise; for He Himself is the only lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy. Moreover, we have irrefragable proof that St. Peter never visited Rome. If, then, he was not appointed Vicar, nor ever was Bishop in the city, where his bishopric is said to have been situated, and where he should have appointed his successors, which is clearly refuted in Dr. Cummings' lectures on Romanism, and by other writers, the first link in the chain is wanting, and the whole falls to the ground. Even if the first were not missing, there would be great danger of the current of mysterious virtue flying off from some links in the middle, which became so vitiated as to be unsuitable conductors.

This doctrine, with its necessary corollary, involves a general principle which admits of various applications, and which is fondly cherished by others than professed papists. It resolves all christianity into an outward law, which has its "fundamental basis or beginning in the incarnation of the Son of God, and actually entered the current of human history by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, when the fruits of the union of God and man in the person of Christ were made over to man." He is organically reunited with God by this introduction of christianity into the world and its history, which is the birth of a new organism, of which the church is the body and christianity the soul or spirit; and in such a sense, too, that the spirit is dependent on and developed by the body. The early church already developed a new form of christianity, different from that of the New Testament church, and this development degenerated to the system of episcopacy, then down through the "Roman hierarchy, and the papal system generally, with its monasticism, its worship of saints, and whatever entered legitimately into the constitution of the



church of the Middle Ages." During this period the true religion lived in the church, which gives it form and feature, and not out of it among certain sects, as the Paulicians, Albigenses, and the Waldenses. This method of redemption reduces the simple, spiritual christianity of the New Testament, in which man is put into direct and undisturbed communication with God, as the Spirit of Truth, to an outward system, placed into the hands of men to be elaborated and perfected by them, and that may change from age to age. It causes the blessings of Christ to be transferred to man through the church and her ordinances as an outward medium, instead of leading him directly to his only Mediator to receive the spiritual, inward gifts of redeeming love. What a striking difference between this mechanical plan of salvation and that taught by the Saviour, which, through repentance and faith wrought by the Holy Ghost, brings man into direct personal union with Him.

In accordance with this principle, the unity of the church is also established by a force *ab extra*, by compelling its members to conform to the same rites and ceremonies, and by restricting it to a certain succession. This uniformity is produced chiefly by ignorance and compulsion, by the enthrallment of the mind and the coercion of obedience, while the real unity consists in the hearty agreement of its members in doctrine and faith.

It asks for an earthly organ or representative of the truth, which shall serve as a standard, ultimate and peremptory in all matters of doubt and disagreement. The system acknowledges that in the Scriptures the Creator has revealed to His creatures certain great truths that pertain to their own welfare, but they are to serve only as general principles, from which the church deduces numerous rules for the regulation of the divine life in man; they are simply the norms according to which the Christian church is developed, and must always be subject to the interpretation of the Holy Father.

But, alas! he practically forgets to consult them, and the *human* interpreter is made the infallible one who speaks in God's stead; whose dictates man must accept in order to be saved, instead of the declarations of the Bible, "written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which speaks authoritatively and finally upon all questions of doctrine and ordinance and duty." He is human, speaking as a man, or as the organ of a sect, who undertakes to set aside the truths of the Holy Book, thus exalting him-

self above God. "Any ecclesiastic, in the language of another, who determines to keep the Bible out of the hands of the people, does the same; steps in between the human spirit and the infinite spirit; says that the Being who made man's soul, and knows its necessities, shall not have direct communication with it; gives it a piece of smoked glass with which to view the King in His loveliness and glory." Can we base our hopes of salvation on the testimony of a man, though he be an ordained official of the church? Can such a foundation ensure that absolute certainty which man wants with reference to the eternal interests of his soul? There is no foundation for absolute certainty in anything human, external, or material. It is alone found in the witness of God's spirit with our spirit; for the things of the spirit must be spiritually discerned. God Himself gives the authoritative statement, and no earthly organ; the Holy Ghost is the only representative of the truth. "If any man do His will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." Each man stands or falls, not to an ecclesiastical community, but to his Maker. He has the same guarantee, that God will give *him* light, as the church or Pope has; and can certainly have more intelligent assurance of salvation by trusting directly in the Saviour through the witness of the spirit, than by relying on human, sensible agencies and authorities.

The office of the church is not to reveal and authenticate the truth, but to promulgate and defend and apply it. It must possess the inherent power of making itself so plain and clear and powerful to the minds of men, that they will accept it on account of itself and its self-evincing power, not because it is humanly proven to be such as it is, to constitute it the highest absolute power in the world. The testimony of a Pope, or the decree of a council, cannot give it additional strength, or superior claims on men for its acceptance. In its own name, and its own strength, it must stand and conquer the human heart. Were this not so, were the testimony of Popes or councils necessary to establish the truth of our Christian religion, then certainly it would not be the highest, nor the absolute power employed in the redemption of the world. It would be shorn of its greatest glory and highest dignity. For the chief excellency of christianity lies in this: that without foreign aid, it binds man directly to God, and rides triumphant over the precariousness of man, until it shall have gathered all the elect to their eternal home.

H. T. S.



## MORAL COURAGE.

WHOEVER is possessed of that spirit which is willing to encounter danger and difficulties with firmness, or without fear or depression, may be said to be a man endowed with the spirit of courage; endowed with that spirit which enables him to engage in the combats of life with heroism and intrepidity, with that firmness of spirit and strength of soul which meets danger without fear. This spirit animates the hero in the field of battle, renders man bold and resolute, and qualifies him for the most daring deeds of life.

There is a courage on a higher gradation; a courage which moves man to battle for the right, to advocate truth and justice, and to defend them, regardless of the persecutions and calumniations of men; to be a hero for the right, at the peril of his life. This virtue is called moral courage. It is the virtue of a man whose integrity being based upon a firm and honest belief, pursues his convictions in the midst of the reproaches of men, and one that will oppose pernicious sentiments and practices, though the world may mock and tyrannical power frown.

It is the imperative duty of every man to give an intelligent adherence to his honest convictions. He should never be so obstinate as to be unwilling to yield to the power of reason; but when there is no sound argument to the contrary, it is his moral duty to remain inflexible in his previous convictions. Man was not made to adopt views simply because they are concurrent with the sentiments of the community. The great Creator has endowed him with a moral, sublime virtue. After he has conscientiously ascertained what is right, it is obligatory upon him as a man, to encounter the most daring deeds for its cause, even if he should be charged with fanaticism. He may feel disposed to be irresolute and inactive; the allurements of the world may tempt him to abandon the sphere of duty and enjoy himself in imaginary pleasures; the path of rectitude may be an uneven path of life; still he should go forward and exhibit the most genuine heroism for the sake of right. It should be no obstacle to him if the whole world opposes him. The great question with him should not be, who is for him or who is against him; but the great question with him should be, duty and right. And being on the side of right, he should defend it, though it meet with the disapprobation of sub-

jects and sovereign. Duty commands him to defend it, though the act cost him his life. Life is dear and peace is sweet ; but they are of minor importance when they must be preserved at the sacrifice of duty.

The possession of moral courage qualifies man for usefulness in life. The individuals who have been instruments in accomplishing the greatest good for mankind, were men endowed with the spirit of moral courage. The deeds that have been the most permanent, and have resulted in the greatest benefit to the world, were the deeds of such men as had given development to the moral nerve. The heroes, both ancient and modern, possessing this virtue, have been enabled to endure the hazards and fatigues of war, and face the cannon's mouth, in order that they might free the commonwealth from the yoke of bondage, and transmit to their country the boon of liberty. Their sublime virtues are enrolled upon the pages of history, and preserved for the emulation of coming heroes, and to be eulogized by future ages. Acting under the influence of moral courage, a few humble, illiterate fishermen propagated the Christian religion in the midst of a brilliant mythology, which had been held in veneration for ages, and, in the midst of Judaism, which raised its arm to give a death blow to their efforts. The ridicule and persecutions of men could not intimidate them. Every effort made to dispel their zeal failed.

The cold walls of the dungeon at Philippi could only inspire its apostolic inmates with songs of praise. And thus they went forward, confident that their cause was true and just, and the result was, that at an early day they were permitted to behold Jesus of Nazareth shed his brilliant rays in the dark regions of heathenism, and illuminate the then civilized world. Under the influence of this sublime virtue, the immortal reformer gathered strength and resolution enough to appear before the Diet of Worms. When his friends endeavored to dissuade him from attending, by reminding him of the fate of the Bohemian martyr, Huss, who had been burned alive under similar circumstances, he replied: "I am called in the name of God to go, and I would go, though I was certain to meet as many devils there as there are tiles on the houses." It was by the inspiration of this courage that he braved the smiles of all the Cardinals in Rome, and the frowns of the so-called vicegerent himself. When the Pope's bull was issued, Luther instead of becoming intimidated at its fierce threats, com-



mitted it to the flames. Thus he and his auxiliaries went on, exposing error and defending the truth; and the result was, the reformation of the sixteenth century. The resurrection of the truth appearing again as some heavenly treasure that had long been buried in the dust.

The individual who endeavors to exert his influence for the promotion of the truth when it is most unpopular, may be encouraged from the fact, that the truth carries within itself a power that can sway the minds of men. As the missionary goes forward to extend the truth among the heathen, he may be induced to be zealous in his arduous labor, from the conviction that the truths of the Gospel themselves will compel the heathen to admire them when they shine before him in all their vivid colors, and constrain him to embrace them, as they did Saul of Tarsus, and become their supporters instead of adversaries. There is a power in truth that can cause its enemy to be abashed, and every individual to blench who ventures to subvert it.

He who has given development to the moral nerve, will realize consolation in the midst of the most appalling horrors of martyrdom. While the body of the Bohemian martyr was being consumed by the flames, his heart was filled with such joy, that he hymned sweet melodies to his God. The soul of Daniel was calm and serene when he was exposed to the mercy of ferocious beasts. The smiling countenance of Stephen, in his martyrdom, bore the similitude of an angel before the majestic throne of God. We plainly see the capability of his being consoled, who is firm and unmoved in his duty, from the tranquillity of the three Hebrew youths, when they were not ignorant of their fate if they refused to prostrate themselves before the golden image in token of adoration.

The cause of truth is the cause of God. Hence, he who becomes a hero for the truth, should be continually mindful of God's immediate presence and power to assist him in his struggles for the truth, and to cheer him when sinking in despair. The recollection of the continued presence of an Almighty God will render duty pleasant, and will enable him who realizes it, to brave the smiles of contempt, and bid the world laugh on while he contends for the cause of God. The world may mock, and tyrants frown, yet he will remain inflexible, and will resemble the man whom the poet has compared to Mount Atlas:

"Whilst storms and tempests thunder on its brow,  
And oceans break their billows at its feet,  
It stands unmoved and glories in its hight.  
His towering soul,  
Midst all the shocks and injuries of fortune rises superior."

J. H. S.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

THE close of the fall term, and the absence of all the students, excepting a few from a great distance, for the Christmas vacation, leaves our halls nearly deserted. Those of us whose homes are here, however, have been finding a pleasant relief of loneliness in the joys of this season of cheerful and blessed memories, and in the encouraging review of the year of prosperity granted to the institution. There is genuine satisfaction in toiling for a good cause, even though success may not immediately crown the efforts. Then faith inspires hope, and hope incites to perseverance. The husbandman may go forth weeping, as he scatters his precious seed, and sows in tears; still he goes forth and sows, in hopeful expectation of a future reward. But when reaping overtakes the plowing, and gathering sheaves the sowing of the grain, joyful harvesters may well pause at times in their work, to praise the Lord for such great favors bestowed upon them. So marked and extraordinary has been the success of this institution during the first two years of its full operations, that the opposition raised against it, and the unkind efforts made to hinder or thwart its aim and labors, have not been worth noticing, or seem only to have promoted its interests.

*Another special cause of encouragement* is furnished by the very favorable action of the *General Synod* of the Reformed church at Cincinnati, in regard to our institution. By that action Ursinus College has received, virtually, the formal recognition of the highest ecclesiastical body of the church. And this has been done in the face of a violent and unjustifiable attempt to injure the reputation of the college in the Reformed church. It is, indeed, denied by Dr. Fisher, the prime and most active agent in



this attempt, that any such injury has been intended. But facts prove the contrary.

Attempts are made to represent it as an *outside* institution, ecclesiastically, and as having *no immediate relation* to the Reformed church. The manifest purpose of such attempts is to excite prejudice against it in the minds of members of the church, by taking false advantage of their church preferences and attachments. In proof of this we need only refer to an assertion to this effect made by Dr. Fisher in the *Messenger* of December 25. And this assertion, as elsewhere stated in our present number, is made in direct contradiction of *his own classification of our college among Reformed institutions*.

It is in view of this assault that the action of the General Synod possesses so much cheering significance, and occasioned such grateful joy in the college and among its many friends, who have testified their joy by numerous congratulatory letters.

The truth is, and it may be frankly declared, that Ursinus College is more thoroughly Reformed, and more entirely committed and bound to the maintenance of Reformed principles, than any full course college in the east. It is directly under the moral control and government of the Reformed (German) church; and the moment it ceases to be so, it forfeits its charter and all its franchises. Other institutions may tolerate doctrines and practices at variance with the historical principles and usages of the Reformed church, and inconsistent with the life and genius of that church; and Synods controlling them may connive at such departures from Reformed principles and practices. But in this respect Ursinus College is bound by obligations which cannot be broken without bringing destruction to its existence.

This fact is not annulled by the independence of the college of formal Synodical jurisdiction. A Synod's college, with all its formal relations to such a body, may, as is well known, be far from representing the real life and faith of the church, and equally far from being governed by that faith and life. The Basel Mission Institute, in Switzerland, was founded by a number of Christian men in their own private capacity, and is under their independent direction. But who will deny that it is a more faithful representative of evangelical Protestantism than the Universities of Tübingen or Heidelberg, though these enjoy formal ecclesiastical recognition and control.

This is what we may justly claim for Ursinus College. Owing to peculiar and justifying circumstances, it is not under any *Synodical* jurisdiction. But for this very reason it is free from the possibly warping and hampering influence and interference of any Synodical partisan power.

It is, however, directly and controllingly under the influence and power of the Reformed church. And its very dependence upon the free, voluntary, untrammelled patronage of the church as such, gives the strongest moral assurance that it will endeavor to prove loyal to the true life of the Reformed church, and to serve its truest interests.

In doing this, Ursinus College will, indeed, not be narrowly or bigotedly *sectarian*. The Reformed principles to which it is pledged, and the religious character which it will labor to maintain, will be found in full harmony with a liberal charity. Otherwise it would not possess one of the prominent characteristics of the Reformed church, as distinguished from the exclusiveness of high-churchism. But whilst not only tolerant of others holding the faith once delivered to the saints, but recognizing them as worthy of full fraternal regard, our institution will not countenance that latitudinarianism which sacerdotal high-churchism is willing to tolerate, if only men will do obeisance to its hierarchy and *worship* its host.

Ursinus College, we therefore reiterate, *is a Reformed institution*. It declares itself such, and gives bonds to this effect in its constitution and subscription books. Philadelphia Classis commends it as such. The General Synod recognizes it as such. And Dr. Fisher's "Almanac for the Reformed Church in the United States," proclaims it as Reformed. What further proof of the fact is needed?

*The winter term* of Ursinus College will open on Monday, January 6, at 9 a. m. It is hoped that all who expect to enter either of the departments of the institution, will endeavor to be prompt in their attendance. Persons desiring catalogues, or special information, may apply as directed in the advertisement published on the last leaf of the *Monthly*.

Students coming from the east by railroad may take the Reading train from 13th and Callowhill streets, Philadelphia, at 7.30 a. m., or the Perkiomen and Phoenixville train, from the Norristown depot, 9th and Green streets, at 1.30 and 4.30 p. m.



Those coming from the west, may take the train leaving Harrisburg, (via Reading), at 5 a. m., 8.30 a. m. or 2 p. m., and leaving Reading at 7.30 a. m., 11 a. m. and 4.20 p. m.

Get tickets for Collegeville Station, which is less than a half mile from Freeland.

For change of cars at any points on the road, inquire of the conductors.

Trains arrive at Collegeville Station at 9.20 a. m. and 3.30 and 6 p. m.

---

PROCLAMATION OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN JAPAN.—Few items of recent news have been received with greater satisfaction and with more devout gratitude to God by the Christians of Europe and America, than the announcement of the repeal of the intolerant laws of the Japanese Empire. It is but a few weeks since the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance was prayerfully considering the best method of bringing the subject of religious liberty before the Japanese Embassy, then just arrived in this country. It was hoped that by calling the attention of these prominent officials to the beneficent working of our laws, they might be induced to exert themselves upon their return to Japan to secure for Christianity the same freedom from State interference which all forms of religion here enjoy. But the wheels of Divine Providence often move more rapidly than our faith anticipates. Before any of the springs of action which we hoped to touch could possibly be brought into play, the object we ardently desired has been effected. *The Mikado has proclaimed the revocation of all edicts forbidding Christianity in Japan!* But while rejoicing at the new door of influence opened to Christian exertion, let us not forget that it was the machinations of the propagators of a corrupt form of Christianity, which three centuries ago led to Japan's being so long closed against the truth. And while we send thither the pure Gospel of Jesus Christ, let us continue everywhere to battle with the error which sowed such pernicious seed in Japan.—*Christian World.*

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*The sixth year of the "Reformed Church Monthly" opens with a fairer sky and brighter prospects even than those which have cheered its past five years' course. It has not only survived malignant opposition, bitter denunciations and petty contempt, but has been permitted to realize, incipiently at least, the purpose for which it was established, and to see that "it has not run in vain, nor labored in vain."* Hardly had it started upon its career, with the avowed purpose of maintaining Reformed principles against the schemes of the New-order party, and of exposing the errors and evil tendencies of that party, before an attempt was made to crush it, and that chiefly by the same agency which has been so active in endeavors to crush Ursinus College. But in spite of all the ungenerous efforts made in this direction, it has lived on, and labored on patiently, persistently, and not ineffectually, pursuing its aim and humbly striving to serve the Church and her dearest interests. And now it is permitted to enter upon another year of its toils, inspired with new zeal, and incited to fresh devotion to the cause to which it has been consecrated, by the encouraging events with which the year past closed.

For this we feel thankful, and thankfully prompted to extend to our many friends hearty New Year greetings. May He "in whose hand our breath is, and whose are all our ways," enable us all to glorify Him with singleness of heart, by working while it is day, knowing that the night cometh when our earthly labors must end. More earnestly than ever, but as far as in us lies, more meekly and patiently too, let us contend for the faith, holding fast the form of sound words delivered unto us in the Sacred Scriptures.

And in order that the Monthly may have enlarged opportunities of doing this, we again bespeak for it the special interest of its friends. *Let all who are in arrears promptly pay up.* And as other duties do not allow us to make direct efforts for the increase of its circulation, *let each present subscriber endeavor to secure at least one or two more.* They can do this with a good conscience, and urge the following reasons upon those whom they may ask to subscribe:

1. The articles of the Monthly all serve to instruct the members of the church in regard to her evangelical faith and practice, and to confirm them therein.
2. The Monthly exposes the errors and evils of high-church ritualism.
3. It furnishes the most important items of church news.
4. It is the cheapest periodical of the kind published, giving 672 pages annually for but \$2.

To those who may desire some additional inducement to cooperate with us, we review the offers made in our December number, with a few additions.

Without pretending to go into *premium* arrangements to any extent, we will still offer the following inducements to some special effort.

For \$3 cash, new subscriber, we will send a copy of the *Monthly* and "*The Christian World*" for 1873.

For 3.50, cash, new subscriber, we will send the *Monthly* and the *Christian Intelligencer* (Reformed Dutch) of New York.



For \$3 cash, new subscriber, we will send the *Monthly*, and the splendidly *Illustrated Christian Weekly*, published by the American Tract Society, for one year from January 1, 1873.

For \$3.50, same conditions, we will send the *Monthly* and the "*Christian Union*" (H. W. Beecher, Editor.)

Four splendid Chromos for every subscriber. Arrangements have also been made by which we can offer a year's subscription to the New York *Christian at Work* and *Eclectic Weekly*, with their four magnificent chromos: "Good Morning," "Carlos in Mischief," "Spring Flowers," and "Summer Flowers," together with our own journal (new subscriber) for \$4.50.

As the chromos alone are worth from \$10.00 to \$15.00, and as the New York publication is in every way first-class, it presents an unusual opportunity to our subscribers. The chromos are made by Prang and other celebrated artists, and will be forwarded promptly by mail prepaid.

Should any subscriber desire only the two first-named chromos, they will be sent with the two publications for \$3.75.

To any one sending new subscribers, and \$6 cash, we will send "*The Christian World*," or "*Illustrated Christian Weekly*," for one year free; or both for 5 new subscribers and \$10.

For 3 new subscribers, and \$7 cash, we will send the *Christian at Work* and two chromos.

And for 5 new subscribers, and \$11 cash, the *Christian at Work* for 1873 and the four chromos.

And finally, for 10 new subscribers, and \$20 cash, we will send *The Christian World*, *The Christian Weekly*, *The Christian at Work*, together with the *Reformed Church Monthly* for 1873, and the four chromos gratis.

In this way those who already take the *Monthly* can at a cheap rate secure for themselves either of the publications offered, with the chromos, and at the same time promote the circulation of the *Monthly*.

*The Reformed Church Messenger on the General Synod*, is giving utterance to the sore disappointment and bitter chagrin of the editor and others at some of the results reached at Cincinnati. It indulges unreservedly, in criticisms upon the proceedings and acts of that highest judicatory of the Reformed (German) church, and has begun a series of articles, the object of which is to show that, in the Appeal case, involving the question of the right of any minister of the Gospel, or of several associated in a college, to give theological instruction, the action of the General Synod is at variance with the Constitution of the church, as well as with its general spirit and principles.

On the theory of the church and church courts, held by those adhering to the old faith and practice of the church, such criticisms are not only allowable but proper, if a Synod is believed to have erred, and if the supposed error is pointed out and discussed in a fair and decorous manner. No one who makes them should be prosecuted, persecuted, or anathematized for doing so. If the decisions of one Synod are honestly believed to be wrong, it is entirely lawful for any who think so, to use all proper means, in a truthful and even earnest way, so to change public sentiment as to secure, if possible, a correction of the mistake

But it is not easy to see how the *Messenger*, as the organ of the high-church party, or how its editor and leading contributors, as advocates of the views of that party (Mercersburg theology) can consistently permit themselves to subject the acts of the General Synod to such hostile criticisms. They have heretofore taken such lofty ground in regard to the doings of only a subordinate district Synod (the Eastern,) so bitterly denounced as factious, rebellious, seditious, open criticisms of its acts, and expressed dissent from its decisions and threatened to bring the disciplinary power of that Synod against any who gave utterance to such dissent and criticisms, that it must now seem exceedingly inconsistent and contradictory of their own hierarchical doctrine, for them to come out in opposition to what a General Synod has done or in condemnation of it. Such contradictory inconsistencies, however, are among the marked peculiarities of the party, and appear to be more gloried in than pearls of purer streams. And it will probably be as easy for the leaders of that party to reconcile their practice in this instance with their theory, as they seem to think it easy for them to show that their Mercersburg theology is in harmony with the Heidelberg Catechism, or that our Reformed fathers did not renounce some of the fundamental heresies of Popery.

Be this as it may, Dr. Fisher and his *Messenger* are really at work with their surgical instruments upon the General Synod. As they have only begun the operation, it would be too soon to review their work in detail. Only a few incidental points shall therefore be noticed, as worthy of passing attention.

1. In the first editorial of the *Messenger*, on the late General Synod, it was gratifying to observe the docile and submissive spirit evinced, and to read the avowal of Dr. F.'s determination to endure patiently the action of the Synod on certain cases, unpleasant as that action might be to him. He declared, moreover, that since matters had so issued, the *Messenger* should set an example of peaceful loyalty, forbearance, and a careful shunning of personalities, which it was hoped would be followed by all concerned.

2. With such gentle assurances before us, it was, however, somewhat startling and painful to meet with direct personal assaults upon those German members of the General Synod who had not asked Dr. F. or his counsellors how they should vote.

First, the editor himself odiously singles them out as *foreign* Germans who voted with the majority, and by their votes decided the question. This is certainly not in harmony with the general tone assumed in the article, though it may have been a momentary escape of the stronger resentful feelings of an offended spirit at the time. It is a pity that in yielding to the pressure, the editor forgot two things. He forgot that instead of there being but "*one or two exceptions*," there were at least *four* if not *six* foreign Germans who voted as Dr. F. wished them to vote. Again, he strangely forgot, that if those Germans thus stigmatized were foreigners *nationally*, they were *ecclesiastically native-born sons of the Reformed Church*. This cannot be said either of some of the chief leaders of the high-church party which the *Messenger* has been striving so hard to shelter and defend. Evidently, the *Messenger* blundered, if it did no worse, in making a distinction so likely to call up other thoughts. Surely such breth-



ren as Klein, Dieckman, Greding, Toensmeier., &c. &c., and Elder Mueller of Ft. Wayne, are far less *foreigners* in any real sense, in our Reformed church, than Higbee, Apple, Leberman, and Elders Zahn and Nevin of Lancaster. And surely, if these last named are justified in Dr. Fisher's eyes in having voted as he was pleased to have them vote, the *former*, as native-born sons, and likely to love their church with true filial affection, and to be far better acquainted with her principles and character, and far more intelligently zealous to maintain them, should not be spotted with an odious distinction for having voted according to *their* convictions. Is this the way in which the editor of the *Messenger* proposes to preserve peace and promote charity, and conduct the controversy in the future?

*Secondly*, not only does Dr. F. himself so unhappily disregard his own counsel, but on the same page on which his editorial appears, publishes an article of Dr. Apple, assailing the German brethren with a measure of bitterness and injustice which has rarely been exceeded by the most violent political campaign tirades. The sum of the offence committed by them, according to the article of Dr. Apple, was, that they showed themselves too firm, too manly, and too christian to be bribed into voting against their convictions, by any mercenary considerations. It is falsely claimed by Dr. A. that the Germans in the West had received large help from eastern Nevinites; indeed that all the aid given to German missions in the west had come from this source. This, we assert, is an erroneous pretension. It could be shown, were it worth while to go to the trouble, that fully as much, nay much more, has been done for German missions in the west by those who do not hold to Mercersburg theology, than by those who do. But even were it otherwise, must our German brethren be held as bondsmen to Nevinism, right or wrong, because Dr. A. and his party may have occasionally given a few dollars to German missions? Is Dr. A. ruled in his course by such mercenary motives? If so, instead of taking offence at the nobler example set at the General Synod, he should take the lesson to heart, and rejoice to find that there are still *Jobs* living who "serve God for naught." It seems, however, that the spirit of high-churchism is the same the world over and in all ages, whoever will not vote for its cause, or obey its dictations, must prepare for the "forty stripes save one," five times repeated. But we feel quite confident that "*foreign German*" backs, can endure the penalty with fully as much indifference to these Mercersburg and Lancaster lictors, as some of their native American brethren have been enabled to display.

There are votes which are not for sale, and there are consciences which cannot be bought or bound by the bribes or the cords of man. In this, under God, lies the deliverance and security of our Reformed church at this time. And if the votes of German brethren at Cincinnati secured the result gained there, which we most cheerfully admit was the case, they were the votes of men who knew what they were doing, who were not afraid to do it, and who in doing it, have conscientiously rendered a service to the church which, if we must so reckon things of this sort, richly repays the church for all the help they have ever received.

*Some other mistakes made* by Dr. F. in the first article of his promised series on the General Synod, may as well be corrected at the start.

He mentions *Ursinus College* as "an institution outside and wholly independent of the Reformed church, as it professes to be." Here Dr. F. forgot—1. That by its charter-constitution, *Ursinus College* is avowedly Reformed, governed by a Board of Directors *three-fourths* of whom must always be members of the Reformed church, and founded explicitly upon Reformed principles in their true historical character. But 2, he still more strangely forgot, that in his own *Almanac* he expressly names *Ursinus College* as among the *Literary and Theological institutions of the Reformed church in the U. S.*

In the opening sentences of his article, he declares that "*it is truth only which he seeks.*" Is the above misrepresentation an example of what the *Messenger* means by truth?

Again the article asserts, that the "precise form of the action of the Martinsburg Synod, was not such as Dr. F. would have preferred."

Did he say so at Martinsburg, or did he try to have the form of the action changed? If not, why make this assertion now?

Again, Dr. F. greatly errs in declaring that after the Martinsburg action, and prior to the General Synod, those aggrieved by the action made special efforts to produce excitement in regard to it, and that wherever space would be afforded them in the public press for the purpose, it was fully occupied. *The worst passions and prejudices of the human heart were appealed to, and all kinds of misrepresentations made.*" Now this is not only an unfounded accusation, but a very harsh and bitter one. It cannot be proven or justified by facts or examples. Many more articles than were written might have been written, and we believe that such articles would have been accepted by many more papers than were asked to publish any thing on the subject. Will Dr. F. name any paper besides the *Christian World*, *Der Evangelist*, and the *Monthly*, which contained articles on the subject by the parties aggrieved? Or let him cite any passages from the articles published, which appeal to the worst passions, &c. Is this sticking strictly to the truth? Assuredly, after that second visit to North Carolina, one might have expected better things.

The article is very unfortunate, furthermore, in making such angry assertions as these: "A calm, careful, unbiased consideration of the points properly at issue, was wholly out of the question. No presentation of facts or power of argument could possibly change the current of things." "The specific purpose for which the forces had been rallied, must be carried out at all hazards." These are hard things for any one to say, of any body or assembly of reasonable men, even though they were met as politicians. But Dr. F. affirms them of Christian ministers and elders, of the General Synod, and so accounts for and characterizes the action of the Synod! And why? Because that action pronounced his interpretation of the Constitution false, and frustrated the plot which had been devised against an obnoxious fellow minister.

But Dr. F. wishes all improper language, and all harsh assaults and all bitterness and uncharitable accusations to be, hereafter, carefully avoided! So he has said. Does any one doubt it?

The Harrisburg *Telegraph* two weeks ago contained an interesting and full account of the action of the *General Synod* on the Appeal cases. The writer correctly



apprehended the true nature and bearing of the action as a severe rebuke to the high-churchism of the party whose schemes were frustrated. As one of the oldest and most devoted sons of the Reformed church, (if we have rightly guessed the authorship of the article) his testimony possesses great value. The answer to his article, by an ecclesiastical *foreigner*, in the *Lancaster Express*, (which had copied the article from the *Telegraph*) is a weak effort, and will have but little weight.

*In this connection* it gives us pleasure to acknowledge the kind notice taken by all our *Evangelical exchange papers*, of the action of the General Synod. Without any exception, all appear to be sincerely gratified with the indications given by that action, of the firm purpose of the Reformed (German) church, speaking through its highest judicatory, to maintain her evangelical integrity against all attempts to move her from it. Assurances of good-will, coming from papers whose circulation reaches hundreds of thousands of copies, and which represent the largest denominations of Protestant evangelical Christians in the country, are an abundant compensation for the sarcasm which has often been indulged by the leaders of high-churchism among us, that the opponents of that movement constitute but an insignificant faction. On which side is the faction now?

*Overlooked—the title page and contents* for 1872. It will be given in the February number.

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

*Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York, have issued another volume of *Schaff's* English edition of Lange's Commentary. This volume includes the *Psalms*. The translation, with large additions, is by Rev. Dr. Forsythe, the Rev. James B. Hammond, and Rev. J. F. McCurdy. A new version of the Psalms by Dr. T. J. Conant, with critical annotations is added to the Commentary. As the successive volumes of this great exegetical work appear, its value becomes more and more apparent. Thoroughly critical in its exegesis, it combines a practical application of the results so secured, in a remarkably happy manner. This renders the work not only helpful to the critical student of the Bible, but edifying to every thoughtful reader.

In the volume before us, this admirable feature of the work is impressively illustrated in the harmony between the specially devotional nature of the sacred text, and that of the exposition of it. The spirit of the Psalmist ruled the mind and heart of the commentator, and of the translators.

The whole work should be in the library of every studious Christian minister, and the many who may not be able to buy it, should be presented with it by their congregations or friends. There are, also, thousands of laymen who would derive incalculable profit from it. But let those who can do no better,

at least supply themselves with this volume on the Old Testament, and with the volume on John's Gospel in the New Testament.

*Hodge's Systematic Theology*, Vol. III, which completes the work, is announced as published. As soon as received, we shall be glad to give a somewhat extended notice of this theological masterpiece of the 19th century.

From the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 1334 Chestnut-st., Philadelphia:

To the more intrinsic attractions of a long list of valuable publications, including many of the best religious and theological books for adults, youth and children, the Board has now added that of one of the largest and finest book stores in the United States. It will be well worth a visit by all who go to Philadelphia.

Among the latest publications of the Board, is an interesting volume entitled "*Presbyterianism Three Hundred Years Ago*," by Rev. Dr. Breed. The term *Presbyterianism*, strictly taken, does not designate the character of this book. For it is rather a condensed historical sketch of the *Reformed Church* (in the broad sense), in the sixteenth century. For all practical purposes, however, the title will convey a sufficiently definite meaning. As a compendious summary, presented clearly and pleasantly, the work will prove valuable, and deserves to be widely circulated. It will be found specially instructive and entertaining by our youth.

From the author, through J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, the publishers, we have received "*The doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as set forth in the Book of Concord, critically examined, and its fallacy demonstrated*," by Rev. J. B. Gross, of Easton, Pa.

The author of this volume is a brother of the distinguished Philadelphia surgeon, Prof. Gross, a son-in-law of Rev. Thomas Pomp, for more than fifty years pastor of the Reformed church in Easton, and a brother-in-law of the late lamented Rev. Dr. Berg. He is now among the older ministers of the *Lutheran* church, and though unable to preach on account of infirm health, has always been a close and earnest theological student. A devoted Lutheran, in a liberal sense, he nevertheless exercises that Christian freedom in regard to some tenets insisted upon as fundamental by certain ultra-Lutherans, which not only the historical faith but the spirit and the standards of his church warrant.

As the title of the work plainly enough indicates, it is controversial. The main object of attack is the erroneous doctrine of the Lord's Supper, set forth in the so-called *Book of Concord*. That unfortunate Book, the device of bigoted adherents to an extreme sense of some of the most extreme statements of Luther and his associates, has rather proven a book of discord from the first. It may, we think, be safely asserted, that for every Lutheran who accepts its declarations on the Lord's Supper, there are five, if not twice that number, who reject them. Mr. Gross is unsparing in their condemnation, and shows their fallacy in a strong light. He adopts, in the main, the Zwinglian views. Whilst his logic is incisive, and his arguments are generally clear, some of his assertions are incautious, and his exposition of texts unsatisfactory.

This holds especially of chapter 9, and his reference to Luke 24:36-40. His dislike of Creeds is, also, somewhat extreme, and not always consistent with his own appeals to orthodox evangelical symbols.

Altogether, however, the effort is a commendable one, and likely to do good, particularly if Ubiquitarians should bring their favorite battery of maledictions to bear against it.

*The minutes of the Eastern Synod of Martinsburg* have been received. It is gratifying to have them published so much more promptly than in years past. The only new feature about them which has attracted our notice, is the *omission of the account of the Treasurer of the Board of Publication*. This omission is to be regretted, for that account enabled the church to ascertain how the periodical publications, such as the *Messenger* and *Mercersburg Review*, were getting along pecuniarily, or how much it might possibly be costing above their receipts to keep them going. The other fiscal accounts are given as usual.

Several new religious (Reformed) papers have been started recently. One in Bethlehem, Pa., "*The Reformed Church Herald*," of which we presume the Rev. J. H. Loos is editor, though not formally announced as such. It is a small quarto single sheet, published monthly at 50 cents a year, and is well furnished with church news. In one feature it has special claims upon our sympathy and good wishes; it is a *private* undertaking, as it has a full right to be.

Another, of quite manly proportions and attractive getting up, comes to us from *Pittsburg*, with the somewhat ambiguous title, "*Our Church Paper*." It appears under the special patronage of the Pittsburg (Reformed) Synod, and will be published twice a month at \$1 a year, and is edited by Rev. George B. Russell.

Trusting that each in its sphere will labor to serve the furtherance of the Gospel and edification of the righteousness which is by faith in Christ, we so far wish success to both.

*In the west*, also, our brethren are displaying commendable zeal in providing for the wants of Sunday-schools and Sunday-school workers, as will be seen from the following announcement which we cheerfully copy from the "*Christian World*," and to which special attention is invited:

*The Heidelberg Teacher* is issued bi-monthly. A neatly printed and bound pamphlet of thirty-two pages. It contains a literary department, *eight lessons* (international series) adapted to use in the Reformed and all Evangelical churches; the text of the Heidelberg Catechism for the corresponding Lord's days, all arranged in the most convenient manner. It affords such help to the Sunday-school teacher as is needed to efficiency in the work. Terms, single copy per year, \$1. Ten copies to same address will be accompanied with six *Lesson Papers* to each copy for use of scholars, at the same rate per copy.

*Heidelberg Lesson Papers*: These contain the lessons for each Sunday, with such explanation as the scholar needs in order to its proper study; also the Catechism for the Lord's day. Terms, per hundred copies, 75 cents; any less number, 1 cent each.





Christian character has, we believe, been otherwise free from reproach, has felt himself justified by his conscience in the course he took, believing that in his case the previous divorce fairly came under the spiritual import of the New Testament rule. But, in the next place, the merits of the case were not before the *General Synod*. It merely decided *a point of order* between the Ohio Synod and the Classis of Illinois, the Synod having failed to pursue the constitutional method in the case. Hence the Synod, in a separate paper upon the abstract question of divorce, declined giving any formal decision as to justifiable grounds of it, beyond the New Testament statement.

PROTESTANTISM IN SPAIN: An absurd statement was telegraphed to the *Associated Press* from Europe a few weeks since, to the effect that "the last Protestant chapel in Madrid had been closed." It need scarcely be said that the story obtained no credit with those who knew that so far from there being but one such chapel in Madrid, there were a number of rapidly growing congregations of Protestants in that city. According to the Madrid correspondent of the *True Catholic*, of May, the false report was a deliberate fabrication of the enemies of evangelical truth. These persons took advantage of the removal of a Protestant congregation from the building it had for two years occupied, and upon the site of which a Protestant church has been erected.

"It is three years since liberty of worship was proclaimed in Spain; and already we can reckon up twenty congregations of some size, in which are found a very encouraging proportion of souls really converted to the Lord. Madrid now possesses seven evangelical chapels of different denominations, in which more than two thousand people hear the Gospel every Sunday and several times in the week. Four of these churches have schools, in which three hundred children receive a Christian education; and on the 3d of last September, M. Carrasco opened a new chapel in the faubourg of Las Panuelas, where there has also been opened a school which had twenty-five pupils on the books from the time of its foundation. Serville is to the south of the kingdom what Madrid is to the centre—a focus of evangelical light. We have long known the zeal of its pastor, M. Cabrera, a converted priest, and the indefatigable activity of Mr. Tugwell, to whom is owing the formation of five congregations and of schools frequented by more than six hundred children. There is here also a school of theology, superintended by Mr. Black, a Scotch pastor, and a training school for female teachers."

THE Hawaiian Evangelical Association, at its late meeting, resolved to establish a Theological Seminary at Honolulu. Theological instruction has heretofore been given in private classes by single missionaries, but now a thoroughly organized seminary is to be established. Rev. J. D. Paris, Revs. L. Smith, D. D., B. W. Parker, and H. H. Parker, are appointed professors. A building has already been purchased for its use. The present plans involve the raising of about \$6,000. This is another of the fruits of the great missionary enterprise through the instrumentality of which this nation has been raised from barbarism to an independent position among the organized nations of the earth, and its people blessed with all the institutions of Christendom.

# JUST ISSUED!

---

## HOME SONGS

For our Nestlings, by the author of Songs for Little Ones, of which nearly 300,000 copies have been sold, beautifully illustrated; 90c. plain. \$1.10 gilt. Postage 12c.

OUR BABY. By Mrs. S. E. Warner. Mrs. Warner has endeared herself to thousands by compiling "Poems of Home Life." Her new and elegant volume is full of exquisitely illustrated poems; and will be admired by all lovers of children. 180 pp. large 16mo. \$1.50; post. 12c.

GRETCHEN, the Day Laborer's Daughter. By Rev. N. Fries. A fresh story of innocence and piety in humble life, well told, and sure to please. Illustrated. 163 pp. 16mo. 80c.; post 12c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISELL,

1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

---

WM. PAINTER & CO.,  
BANKERS,  
No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

---

Gold, Stocks and Bonds

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE

PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.



# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

WINTER TERM, 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The WINTER TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, will open on Monday, JANUARY 6, 1873, and continue sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

WILLIAM H. SNYDER, Instructor in the Academic Department.

J. G. NEFF, Tutor.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.—FEBRUARY, 1873.—No. 2.

LOOKING UNTO JESUS.

How much there is in these few words, even when taken by themselves. The pious *Ambrose*—not he of *Milan*, who lived in the fourth century—but the still more devout and the more truly apostolical Isaac Ambrose, of *Glasgow*, who lived and labored only two hundred years ago, found enough in them to suggest matter for a large volume of profitable meditations upon the person and the work of our blessed Redeemer. And yet he did not exhaust their import. He could not. No single mind or heart, however thoughtful, however deeply imbued with the spirit of the admonition, however large and lively its experience by faith and love of the excellence of the glorious object of contemplation, could see and appreciate it in all its aspects. To do so, would require not only an intellect of infinite capacity, and a heart of infinite affections, but power also to occupy at once all the various positions of all believers, and to share all the trials, perplexities, and emotions of their varied circumstances and wants. For as Jesus is to every true believer just what he needs in every stage of his pilgrimage or his warfare, so Jesus *appears* to every believer in that form and aspect which is best suited to each one's need at the time.

Let these rich words, then, furnish a theme which may very appropriately follow that of the article in January, with which we began the year. We may thus learn more fully how to keep the heart strong and unwavering in the courage inspired by gratitude for divine favors received in days and years gone by.

*The Point of View*

From which the Christian is urged to look unto Jesus, his position, state, and peculiar circumstances, are simply those of every true follower of the Lamb, so long as he continues in the flesh. They are plainly pointed out in the Bible, and may be found particularly described in those portions of the Epistle to the Hebrews which immediately precede the verse (12: 2), in which the exhortation is given.

According to this description, the true Christian is a pilgrim and a soldier. He knows and feels this. The two characters are combined in him. He is a pilgrim and a stranger. This world is not his home. Here he has no continuing city. This, in his case, is not simply a truism, a fact recognized in a formal and thoughtless way, or admitted as something undeniable. It is an article of his heart's creed, something which he really believes, and loves to believe. He is a traveler ever moving onward towards another country; not as captive borne from his native land against his will, whilst his heart yearns to get back again; not as a prisoner placed in fetters on board of a vessel which carries him in spite of cries and tears to distant foreign shores. He wishes to be a pilgrim. Faith has led him to fix his hopes on another country, even heaven, and he longs to reach it. That hopeful faith makes him glad to know and feel that every year, every day, every step, is bringing him nearer to his home, his everlasting home. By that faith he contemplates the land afar off, and pants to be there.

But his pilgrimage must be made through what is spiritually a desert, and that desert beset with dangers and infested with foes. A world of sin, and under the power of sin, cannot be otherwise. There are, indeed, many things provided for him on the way, which serve to lessen its trials and assuage its sorrows. But those provisions are heavenly; they are not such as the world supplies, but are bestowed by Him who gave His people of old "bread from heaven to eat." In the world, as such, he has only tribulation. And in his own flesh, as by mere nature related to the world, dwelleth "nothing good" for a pilgrim whose face and heart are turned toward the better land.

Hence, the Christian pilgrim, must be a soldier, too. As he travels, he must fight. His staff is a sword, his sandals are greaves, the covering of his head is a helmet, and his chief raiment the shield of faith and the breastplate of righteousness.



A pilgrim on such a journey, a soldier involved in such a warfare, may well need strong courage and enduring patience to carry him safely through.

Beset with perils, opposed by foes, the road often rough, and the night very dark, his ultimate failure might seem unavoidable, and his destruction sure. It is true he may be told of the many heroes of faith who in times past traveled the same course, and fought the same fight successfully, coming off more than conquerors." He may be cheered with the assurance, that the spirits of those victorious heroes invisibly compass him about as an animating cloud of witnesses, watching him, sympathising with him, and beckoning to him not to yield to weariness or to fear. This, however, only supplies *moral* incentives to patient endurance. It imparts no real vigor to his fainting strength. It can put no real prop under his sinking heart, or reanimate effectually his drooping soul. Much as the examples of patriarchs and prophets and martyrs of other ages may be worth, as moral incentives to an imitation of their virtues, he needs more than that. He needs something better than even the cheering voices of triumphant saints, could they be heard calling to him in songs and shouts from "the other side." How shall he secure what he needs? How shall he obtain it there in the midst of the desert, and that desert a battle-field?

*Looking unto Jesus.*

There is succor at hand. He need not despair. Nay, he need not even despond. His case, his situation and wants, are known. They have been all anticipated, and provided for in advance. And they are *most fully* provided for, by one who not only knows how to do it, but how to do it effectually.

But in appropriating the help thus placed within his reach, the pilgrim warrior must closely follow the counsel given him. This counsel involves some

*Things not to be Done.*

Thus he is *not to look or appeal to the cloud of witnesses* by which he may be compassed about. The Gospel no where sets up *patron saints* as objects of prayerful veneration, or as sources whence needful aid may be obtained. Only turn to that first verse of the 12th chapter of Hebrews, and see how easy and natural it would have

for the been inspired writer to have introduced the doctrine, had there been any place or ground for it in the Gospel system. Indeed, one might have almost expected him after having so graphically delineated the cloud of witnesses and named a number of those witnesses so honorably in the preceding chapter, to go on and say: Looking to and remembering the excellent examples thus set you, and seeking earnestly their influence and intercessions on your behalf.

But there is not the most distant intimation of the sort. In all that cloud, there is not one to whom the Christian may turn in his trials or temptations, for comfort or succor. Saint Abraham, saint Isaac, and saint Jacob are there, but not even the most loving son of the patriarchs may call on them for help. Saint Abel, saint Enoch, saint Noah are there; so are saint Joseph, saint Moses, and saint Elijah, and all the rest mentioned, with many others, more than the Apostle could take time or thought it needful to name or enumerate. But to none of them singly, neither to all collectively, is the heart and prayer of the Christian directed for assistance. Radiant as that cloud may be with the illumining glory of those in glory who compose it, there is a brighter, nobler object beaming above it, and through it, to which the believer's eye is enrapturing turned. It is *Jesus*. Why should any call on Abraham for help, when the pilgrim patriarch's *Jehovah-jireh* is at hand?

*Looking away*, (this is the force of the original), therefore, from those in the cloud, whoever they may have been then, and whoever may have been added to their number since, is the first thing to be done.

Very plausible reasons, (human reasons, earthly, superstitious, sacerdotal, ritualistic reasons), may, indeed, be given, for praying and looking to angels, departed saints, or other creatures, for spiritual aid in spiritual extremities. We have seen and read such reasons. They may be met with in many a Roman Catholic book, and heard from many a Romish priest. They may sometimes be met with, though perhaps somewhat covered up, or only hinted at, in the writings of men who are Papists at heart, whilst unwilling to be called such. And thousands are misled and deluded by such plausible and specious reasons, to look and pray to saints for succor in their times of need. But however plausible the doctrine may be taught, it is false and pernicious. Nothing

to warrant it can be found in the whole compass of the Sacred Scriptures. The only instance of a prayer being offered or addressed to an Old Testament saint, given in the Bible, is that of Dives in hell, to Abraham in Paradise. And surely that case gives little countenance to the doctrine, or comfort to those who hold and practice it.

But if the Christian may not look in prayer for help to such as are declared by the Bible to be saints in heaven, how much less may he pray to any of the thousand departed spirits of whose present abode there is no *such* assurance, though Rome or Oxford, or any other hierarchy of earth may have canonized them.

*As little*

May the Christian look for needed aid in his circumstances, to any thing he has done, or may do. Not to his own righteousness or strength, for they are vanity. Not to any good works, to any penances or prayers, to any earthly priests, or sacraments, or altars, as if they could help him, even by his most superstitious reliance upon them. Fasting, until he becomes emaciate and faint; crawling upon his hands and knees up St. Peter's in Rome, or any other temple steep in any other place; keeping matins and vespers with the birds of early dawn, or the bats of the midnight hour, none of these things will secure what he needs. Bestowing his goods to feed the poor, or to enrich the temple, or to comfort Pope Pius, trying in his *poverty* to eke out a miserable living on a \$100,000 a year; giving his body to be burned, even though for the testimony of the Gospel, through the cruelty of the inquisition, all this will be of no avail.

He must *look unto Jesus*, from beyond the earth, and the church on earth; from beyond the witnessing cloud of ransomed saints, which faith may regard as hovering over the scene of his toil and conflict; from far above and beyond these must his help come. So the Gospel declares. So all true saints who make the inspired *Word written* their rule of doctrine, and daily counsel, unite, and ever have united in declaring. So all such have always done. St. Stephen in his martyrdom did so. St. Peter before the arbitrary Sanhedrim did so. Paul and Silas did so, amidst the darkness of the dungeon in Philippi. So did St. John amidst the raptures of his exile on



Patmos. None of them looked to angels or to saints for succor, but *all to Jesus, and Jesus only.*

How and why—may be shown in another article.

---

## THE GENERAL SYNOD AT CINCINNATI.

### SECOND ARTICLE.

FOLLOWING the order of the principal acts of the late General Synod, the next item claiming attention, is

#### *The Elder Dunn Appeal Case.*

This is the brother whom some one was allowed by the *Messenger*, publicly to stigmatize as "*a contentious Elder.*" Because he believed himself and the people whom he represented, wronged by an action of Mercersburg Classis, and took the liberty of saying so in an earnest but respectful way, and of appealing from Classis, he must be denounced as a contentious man, a troubler of the peace of the church! He is, and has long been, an Elder in the Reformed church, set apart to the office by solemn ordination—by an ordination which those very Mercersburg brethren almost pervert into a sacrament. His duties as an Elder are as clearly set down in our church constitution as those of "teachers of theology." They require him, among other things, to have a care for the maintenance of the rights and privileges of the church. In this capacity it was his right *and duty* to speak out, and use all lawful and Christian means, in any case which he honestly believed to be wrong and hurtful to himself and the church. In doing so he did not justly expose himself to the unkind and opprobrious charge of contentiousness.

Furthermore, Elder Dunn was a regularly appointed *delegate* to the Classis, chosen by his congregation to represent them and the church, in whatever might claim the attention of Classis. It may be added, also, that he represented them not only in *form* and *name*, but in *reality and fact*. That is, *he truly represented the sentiments and views of the great majority of those who had chosen him.* This, it is to be feared, is not always the case. On the contrary, it may often happen that the Elder of a charge who attends a

Classis or Synod as a delegate, may be the only member of the charge who holds the sentiments he supports at Classis, or that, at best, he may represent the views of less than one-twentieth of the charge. If all congregations and charges would be careful to select and send only such delegates as truly and fairly represent the prevailing views of the people—which should always be done—our distracted church might have escaped many of the evils which have been troubling her for the last ten or fifteen years. This is an important matter and worthy of prompt and earnest consideration.

Now, as such a *delegate*, Elder Dunn had a full right to oppose any action of his Classis which he believed to be unconstitutional and wrong. He not only had the right to do so; he was in solemn duty *bound* to do so. It might be a hard duty to perform, especially in Mercersburg Classis. Elders are apt to be timid and backward in such things. They are often afraid to speak out and give free expression to their convictions, even when they clearly see an error, and deeply feel a wrong. Instead, therefore, of being frowned upon, brow-beaten, and calumniated, when they summon boldness to speak, they should be encouraged and treated with courtesy and kindness. This should be done in the Classis of Mercersburg as well as in any other. No doubt it has had, and may still have, very learned and able ministers in it, who are zealous for their peculiar views and measures. Nevertheless, even such *may* err. And if any delegate, *though but an elder*, really thinks they have erred, he has a right to say so, as well as he can, and to try to have the error remedied. The mere fact that he may differ in his view of any case from his more learned ministerial or doctoral brethren, is no reason for smiting him on the mouth if he ventures to speak against their views. Elders, as delegates, are not mere voting machines to help to swell a majority for those who may essay to dictate what ought to be done. When Elders Wingert, or Martin, or Heyser, speak in favor of matters proposed in the Classis named, they are not reproached or denounced. Why then should another Elder, who may honestly think and speak otherwise, be rebuked, and called *contentious*?

*Occasion of the Appeal.*

This has already been published in the *Monthly*. The matter is, however, of sufficient importance and interest to be stated

again, with special regard to the points and principles involved in the whole case.

In the Classis of Mercersburg, as everywhere else throughout the church, there are many who have no sympathy with the ritualism or the ritualistic theology of the so-called Mercersburg party (Nevinism), and who would not knowingly support it or any of its operations. Indeed, it is believed that even in that Classis nine-tenths of the members would vote against it, if the matter were fully presented to them, and a fair opportunity were given to express their sentiments. In the case of some congregations, the matter is pretty well understood, and the opposition is accordingly decided. Such congregations are not willing to contribute their money to uphold and promote the New Order innovations.

Now, whilst the leaders of the new movement might be quite willing to let such members *think* what they please about ritualism, or to see them leave the church if they do not like ritualism, those leaders know very well that they need help to carry on their measures. They might get along without such members, but they *can't get along without their money*.

To raise the money needed, it has been usual to ascertain the amount required for different objects (beneficiary education, &c., &c.,) and then to apportion this sum among the different congregations, according to their supposed ability to pay. In ordinary times, and under ordinary circumstances, *assessments* so made have been assented to, especially as it was fully understood that they meant no more than an earnest appeal to the people for their free contributions to the cause or objects named and enumerated. But, in the state of things now unhappily existing in the church, in consequence of the ritualistic innovations, there is a natural and justifiable unwillingness on the part of many to give their money to promote those innovations. Hence, some pastors and congregations have refused to raise amounts assessed to support the benevolent schemes of the New Order party.

This, of course, was a serious matter, and threatened bad consequences to the cause of Mercersburg theology. It was felt to be necessary to check the evil, if possible, by bringing ecclesiastical authority to bear in full force against such opposition. Those who showed an unwillingness to raise the assessments made by Classis, must be taught their duty, and frightened, if possible, into compliance with the wishes of Classis.



It is an unfortunate habit which some of our extreme high-church brethren have somehow acquired, of trying to terrify those who differ from them, into obedience to their requirements.

A case of this sort presented itself at the last annual meeting of Mercersburg Classis. The Huntingdon charge, represented by Elder Dunn, was not willing to give money raised for beneficiary purposes, (or for any other benevolent object) to Mercersburg, but preferred sending it to Tiffin, or to Ursinus College. Against this now the Classis adopted (as already reported), the following resolution :

*"Resolved, That this Classis requires of her congregations, that the contributions for beneficiary education be paid to the students for whose support the Classis has made itself responsible ; and no alienation of funds will be permitted by consistories, until our obligations have been met."*

As will be noticed, the resolution is awkwardly worded ; its meaning, however, is plain enough. Elder Dunn, and probably everybody else at the time, understood it to be an explicit requirement of Classis, that money raised in the Huntingdon charge or in any other charge within the bounds of Classis, must be paid over for the use of the beneficiaries of the Classis, at Lancaster, or at Mercersburg, until all the obligations of the Classis to such beneficiaries were met. That is, every congregation was *required* to support, or aid in supporting, Mercersburg beneficiaries, whether they approved of Mercersburg theology or not.

Elder Dunn believed this resolution to be unjust and oppressive to himself and his constituents. So he appealed from the action to the Eastern Synod, the next higher court. The Synod of Martinsburg, (as already reported in the *Monthly* by Professor Super), sustained the action of Mercersburg Classis, against the appeal, and a second appeal was taken from the decision of the Eastern Synod to the *General Synod*.

But here again, as in other cases, the leaders of the New Order party tried to hinder the course of justice, and to foil the attempt to secure personal rights, by declaring the appeal out of order. Of course both Prof. Super and Elder Dunn, whom he represented as counsel, knew that this objection to the appeal was absurd in the premises and possibly only a trick to embarrass the case. Instead, therefore, of yielding this point at Martinsburg, they insisted upon their right of appeal. For doing so in the firm and resolute way

in which they did it, the church owes them thanks. An example and a precedent have thus been set, which will no doubt secure beneficial results. The Constitution of the church gives to every member of a lower judicatory, the right of appeal, at his own discretion, from any of its acts, and no such body can equitably interfere with that right.

But to prevent a waste of time at the General Synod in contending about a point of order, or a question of abstract right, the case was brought before that body in the form of a *complaint*.

*The case before the General Synod.*

The complaint having been found in order, and the usual provision having been made for attending to it, came formally before the Synod on Monday evening and Tuesday, December 2 and 3. The same order was observed as in the previous appeal case, with a slight difference as to the time allowed for each side.

The Rev. Dr. E. H. Nevin, of Philadelphia, appeared as counsel for Elder Dunn, and the Rev. Drs. Higbee and Apple as defendants of the Eastern Synod (and of course Mercersburg Classis.)

Dr. Nevin argued the case forcibly on the following points :

1. The plain import and purpose of the action of the Classis of Mercersburg, was fairly assumed to be a declaration of its right and determination to make whatever assessments it thought proper upon pastors and their congregations, for the maintenance of its beneficiary and other benevolent objects, to *require* congregations and pastors to make efforts to raise the amounts of such assessments, and to *forbid* their appropriation of money raised for beneficiary (or other benevolent) purposes, to any such purposes outside of the Classis, until the obligations of the Classis for such objects had been fully met.

2. This declaration and purpose were shown to be an infringement upon the personal liberty of every Christian, a violation of his individual rights. In this view, the action and claims of the Classis were contrary to the nature and Constitution of the church, and to the principle of almsgiving, as laid down in the Scriptures. No Consistory, Classis, or Synod has authority, either from the Word of God or from our Constitution, to levy and enforce such assessments. The judicatories of the church derive all their authority from the church, which stands nearest to Christ, and those judicatories can impose nothing upon the people which the church,

through the Constitution, does not allow them to impose. There is not a word in the Constitution which allows a Classis to levy and enforce assessments for benevolent purposes, and to order how they shall be appropriated. If the Classis of Mercersburg can arrogate this right, the Classis of Philadelphia may do the same. But how great an uproar would be made at Lancaster, if the Classis of Philadelphia would lay an assessment for beneficiary purposes upon the Green Street church, and forbidding any amount so raised from being sent to Lancaster, would require it all to go to the support of students at Ursinus College, or at Tiffin?

Carry out the principle assumed by the action of Mercersburg Classis, and the members of our church would be brought into subjection to priestly power, as they have had it in Spain, Italy, Mexico, &c. After awhile they would be denied the right of refusing anything, but be compelled to say and do whatever the powers claiming to govern them might require. This tendency must be met, rebuked, suppressed. And to aid in doing this, the complaint before this body should be sustained.

*The Reply by Drs. Apple and Higbee,*

In defence of Mercersburg Classis and the Eastern Synod, proceeded throughout on the assumption, that *the action of the Classis in the first case had been wholly misapprehended and misrepresented*; that it did not intend at all to lay any sort of constraint on pastors or congregations in the matter of supporting the benevolent operations of the Classis, or to interfere in the least with the full liberty of the people to give or not to give their money in aid of New Orderism and Mercersburg theology.

Thus Dr. Apple declared that the Classis of Mercersburg meant merely to let the people know, as it were, how much was needed to carry forward certain benevolent objects, and to solicit them to do so, or so much for it. Nothing like coercion, compulsion, is thought of.

With reference to that part of "*the resolution*" which forbids *alienation*, he said all it meant was, that if a congregation had contributed money for the support of A B C, at Mercersburg, or Lancaster, the Consistory had no right to take that amount and apply it to the aid of some other student, at some other institution!

It is true he followed up these exceedingly plausible assertions



with statements which seemed quite irrelevant, out of place, if his explanation of the matter was correct. Thus he became very emphatic and positive in declaring the principle of *Church authority* in such cases. He insisted that a Classis must have the right to *require congregations and pastors to aid it in sustaining its beneficiaries*. That to deny this, would lead to anarchy and individualism in the lowest form, from which he prayed the Lord would deliver us.

Dr. Higbee followed in the same line of argument, substantially reiterating what Dr. A. had said, and trying to emphasize his contradiction of the sense put upon the action of Classis. And yet, like Dr. A., his ruling hierarchal sentiments could not be wholly suppressed. They would come out. Though he had said that all was meant to be voluntary, he insisted that it must be so submissively to the expressed will of an authority higher than the individual, that is, the Classis or Synod.

#### *The General Discussion.*

After the counsel on both sides had concluded, the case was open for five-minute remarks by members of the Synod. A large number of delegates expressed their views on the subject. In favor of the complaint, the speakers were Revs. F. A. Rupley, A. Wanner, Dr. Welker, F. Forwick, Dr. Williard, D. E. Klopp, P. Greding; and Elders Brown, Mueller, and Wiest. On the other side, were Revs. P. S. Davis, Dr. Miller, J. Kretzing, J. W. Steinmetz, C. Cort, Graeff, Russell, Aughinbaugh and Loos; and Elders Bousch, Craigh, and Seibert.

The former, taking the action of Mercersburg Classis in the obvious sense of its words, dwelt upon its injustice, unconstitutionality, and inconsistency with the Christian principle of charity.

The latter partly denied that the resolution of Classis meant anything compulsory, and yet partly, also, maintained and defended the position that a Classis had a right to lay assessments, and to insist upon their collection.

On taking the vote, the complaint was sustained by 90 to 85. In explanation of the significance of this decision, the following resolution was subsequently adopted: "*Resolved*, That no Consistory or other judicatory has any right to alienate any funds from the purposes for which they were contributed. But that Con-

sistories have the undoubted right to designate the direction which benevolent funds in their hands shall take when not specially designated by the donors."

In view of the policy adopted by the counsel for the Eastern Synod and the Classis of Mercersburg, by denying positively that the action of the Classis meant what it was understood to mean by the complainant and by many others, it will be well to look at the case somewhat more closely before dismissing it. This is the more necessary now, as Dr. Fisher in the *Messenger* of January 22d, endeavors to gloss over the whole matter, in order to make the complaint of Elder Dunn appear absurd, and the action of the General Synod ridiculous.

We assert that the action or resolution of Mercersburg Classis, really did mean what those who opposed it understood it to mean. Our grounds for this assertion are the following:

1. The wording of the resolution itself. Look at it in its separate clauses:

"This Classis *requires* of her congregations that the contributions for beneficiary education be *paid to the students for whose support the Classis has made herself (!) responsible.*"

Here is a direct peremptory requirement. It is made *not upon Consistories*, who may have moneys collected for the purpose named in the resolution, but *upon congregations* which may raise such money. The requirement is, that the congregations *shall give money raised for such purpose to the support of the students of the Classis*, and hence are not allowed to give it to other beneficiary students.

If this is not the meaning of the resolution, it has no sense. The language may be awkward and bungling. But Dr. Fisher cannot get the Classis or himself out of the unpleasant predicament in which the arbitrary and unconstitutional action of the Classis involves them, by pretending that the language is "obscure." It is not obscure. The purport of it is quite clear and plain. And it will be admitted to be so by every one who is not specially concerned to explain away its true significance. Evidently the Classis intended to assert its right to require congregations within its bounds to give their contributions for beneficiary purposes, to the beneficiary students of the Classis, as long as the Classis needed money for their support. That is, all its congregations, whether they approved of the Mercersburg theology or

not, were required to support that system by supporting its beneficiaries.

Now, take the other part of the resolution—"No alienation of funds will be permitted by Consistories, until our obligations have been met."

Who ever thought of this meaning what Drs. Apple and Higbee said it meant, viz: That when a congregation gave money for students at Mercersburg or Lancaster, no Consistory might appropriate such money to the beneficiary students of some other institution, say Tiffin, Sheboygan, or Ursinus? No honest Consistory would wish or dare to do this.

The real sense of this part of the action, is fixed by what precedes. Thus interpreted the action means, and can only mean, that no money raised in a congregation within the bounds of the Classis of Mercersburg, can be alienated from the beneficiary claims of the Classis, until all that Classis has promised to its beneficiaries be paid.

When Drs. Apple and Higbee affirm that they do not so understand the action, and that they do not consider that to be its meaning, civil courtesy and Christian charity require us to accept their declaration. At the same time, we need not overlook the fact, that along with their repudiation of the sense put upon the resolution by others, they avowed the very principle on which the objectionable sense rests, and *maintained the right* of Classis to do the very thing which they denied was meant by its action. Dr. Gerhart, Rev. G. B. Russell, Elder Bousch, and others on that side, took precisely the same ground. In this, of course, they glaringly contradict themselves, and we leave them to explain the contradiction.

2. Our other ground for holding the sense given to the resolution, is that just intimated, viz: That on the floor of Synod, in the debate on the case, as well as after, elsewhere, the leaders of New Orderism avowed, and have often avowed, the very principle underlying and pervading the offensive and arbitrary resolution. They contend (falsely of course), that the opposite must lead to anarchy and disruption. They argue that if you yield the personal freedom claimed in such matters, there must be disorganization. Indeed, Dr. Higbee and Rev. C. Cort, pretty plainly declared, that if the Eastern Synod and Mercersburg Classis were not sustained in such matters, it would be better for the church to divide.



3. But we have still more practical and matter-of-fact-proofs that the sense in which the resolution in question was taken by those who opposed it, is the true sense in which it was meant.

The facts are the following :

1. In this very Classis of Mercersburg, a pastor who is conscientiously opposed to the errors of Mercersburg theology, and who objected to complying with the requirement of Classis, to try to raise funds for the support of its specific benevolent educational objects, was bluntly and very positively told, that he had no *right to oppose his individual conscience in such matters to the will of the Classis*. It was Dr. Gerhart who said this, publicly, and on the floor of Classis, and who may therefore be held publicly responsible for saying so. What did that mean, if it did not mean substantially the very thing understood to be asserted in the resolution of said Classis ?

2. A second fact, known to be a fact, is that ministers of East Pennsylvania Classis have asserted and endeavored to enforce similar views upon brethren in that Classis who are opposed to high-churchism, or Nevinism.

3. And now comes a third fact, in painful confirmation of all that has been said. Since the meeting of the General Synod, a minister who took a prominent part in advocating the cause of the Eastern Synod, and of Mercersburg Classis in this case, and a former member of Mercersburg Classis, had the effrontery to tell an active and earnest fellow-minister who does not coincide with Nevinism, that if he is not willing to help the (high-church) benevolent objects of his Classis, he ought to leave it and seek another field. This brother's congregation called him, love him, wish him to stay with them. But ——— tells him he ought to go somewhere else because he cannot and will not support or cöoperate with Lancaster high-churchism ! What does this mean, if it does not mean the very spirit and import of the resolution and action from which thousands and tens of thousands in the church are glad that Elder Dunn at the Classis, and Prof. Super at the Synod of Martinsburg, boldly and earnestly appealed ?

The simple fact, in our conviction, is this. After the action in question was resisted, and so brought to the notice of the church, it was found and felt to involve a damaging exposure of the overbearing and tyrannical spirit of the party whose sentiments the action represented and expressed. They became alarmed for the

consequences, and afraid of a reversal of their action at the General Synod. And no wonder. Hence the efforts to put another construction upon it, and to take, as it were, the breath out of the opposition to it, by denying that the Classis of Mercersburg meant what was charged upon it. It may be conceded, even, that those who did so, really got themselves to think that it meant something else. Only if they did think so, they should not have contradicted themselves so broadly by the principles they advocated, and should not tell faithful ministers who differ from them, that if they cannot comply with the requirements of their Classis in such matters, they should go somewhere else.

The points determined by the General Synod, in sustaining Elder Dunn's appeal, are the following :

1. *Negatively*—No congregation or pastor may refuse to contribute towards the defrayment of the *contingent expenses of a Classis or Synod*. This is unanimously admitted, and there is no difference of opinion on this point.

No Consistory may alienate money collected in a congregation for a certain object, by appropriating it to a different object. There never was any difference of opinion on this point.

2. *Positively*—Every congregation, and every member of a congregation, has an undoubted right to select the object or objects to which their money may be given. They cannot be required, if they are opposed to New Orderism, to give to its support. If, instead of supporting beneficiaries at Lancaster or Mercersburg, they prefer giving aid to those at Tiffin, Sheboygan, or Ursinus, they are to have full, untrammelled liberty to do so.

And this decision of the General Synod must commend itself to every candid mind, as equitable, constitutional, and in perfect harmony with the spirit of gospel beneficence.

As the interest and importance of this case have unavoidably lengthened out the present article, other points must be deferred to our next number.

---

SABBATH may be a delightful day in the household by special privileges, appropriate songs, and readings chosen in turn, till the little ones count it the best day of all the seven.

THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

CHAPTER XIV.

*Of the Repentance and Conversion of Man.*

THE Gospel has the doctrine of repentance joined with it, for the Lord says: "Repentance and remission of sin should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke 24: 47.

By repentance, we understand the change of heart in a sinful man, stirred up through the Word of the Gospel and the Holy Spirit, by which the sinner recognizes his inborn corruption and all his sins, when convinced by the Word of God, and is heartily grieved on account of them, and not only bewails and confesses them before God, but also abhors them, and continually strives after improvement, and all the remaining days of his life exercises himself in unceasing diligence in innocency and virtue.

And in truth this is true repentance, namely, an honest turning of one's self to God and to all goodness, and an earnest turning away of one's self from the devil and all evil. We say often, that such repentance is the mere gift of God, and not the work of our own strength. 2 Tim. 2: 25; Acts 5: 31; Acts 11: 8.

The sinful woman in the Gospel who washed the feet of the Lord with her tears, and Peter who bitterly bewailed with tears the denial of his master, show in what state the heart must be *in repentance*, namely, earnestly lamenting the sins committed. Luke 7: 38; Matt. 26: 75. Also the prodigal son, and that publican who is compared with the Pharisee in the Gospel, set forth to us suitable forms in which we are to confess our sins to God. Luke 15: 18, 19. The latter did not venture to lift up his eyes. Luke 18: 13. We do not doubt but that the Lord received them to grace.

And although the doctrine of the Gospel appeared to be a *new doctrine* when brought out by Jesus against the doctrine of the law as held by the Pharisees, as Jeremiah had also prophesied of the New Testament; yet it was fundamentally not only old, and is such yet (though the Papists again call it new in antithesis to that of Rome), but it is precisely of all doctrines the oldest in the world. Jer. 31: 31. For God from all eternity had



determined to save the world by Christ, and He revealed this, His eternal counsel and predestination, through the Gospel. 2 Tim. 1: 9, 10. Hence, it is plain that the evangelical religion and doctrine is the oldest of all that ever were, are, or ever shall be. Hence, we say that all they are terribly deluded and speak unworthy of this high counsel of God, who call the evangelical doctrine and religion, a newly-arisen faith scarcely thirty years old. To such, the words of Isaiah apply well—"Wo unto them that call evil, good; and good, evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter." Isa. 5: 20.

John says: "If we confess our sins," &c. John 1: 9, 10.

But we believe that this sincere confession to God alone, either between God and the sinner privately, or publicly in the church where the general confession of sin is made, is sufficient; and that it is not necessary in order to obtain the forgiveness of sins, that any one should confess his sins to the priest, whispering the same into his ears, that thereupon he might receive of him the absolution with the laying on of hands. In this respect we have no commandment, and of this there is no example in the Bible. David testifies and says in Psalm 32: 5: "I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin, Selah." Yea, and the Lord himself, when he teaches us to pray and to confess our sins, said (Matt. 6: 9, 12), "after this manner, therefore, pray ye . . . forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." Hence, it is necessary that we should confess our sins to God the Father, and become reconciled to our neighbor, if we have offended him. It is of such kind of confession of sin that James speaks, in 5: 16. But if any man, oppressed by the weight of his sins and their temptations, desires privately to seek counsel, instruction and comfort from one of the ministers of the church, or from a friend who is well versed in the law of God, we do not condemn this. So we also commend very highly the general public confession of sin in the church, which is wont to be read in public worship, since it is agreeable with the Scriptures.

But, as concerning the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which the Lord committed to the Apostles, many strange things have been spoken, and there have been forged from them swords, lances, sceptres and crowns, and full power has therefrom been

deduced over the greatest empires, yea, over men's souls and bodies. We decide simply according to the Word of God, and say: Each and every legitimately called minister has and makes use of the keys of the kingdom of heaven, when he proclaims the Gospel; that is, when he teaches, exhorts, comforts, reproves and preserves in discipline, the people committed to his charge. For so they open the kingdom of heaven to the obedient, and *shut* the same to the disobedient.

These keys the Lord promised to the Apostles (Matt. 16), and gave to them (John 20; Mark 16: 15; Luke 24: 47.) Then He sent them forth and commanded them to preach the Gospel in all the world, and to remit sins. The Apostle says in 2 Cor. 5: 18, that the Lord "hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;" and shortly after he explains what this is, (in v. 19) "*the word of reconciliation.*" And still more plainly to expound His words, he adds (v. 20), "Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

Hence, they make use of these keys when they persuade us to repentance and faith; thus they reconcile men to God; thus they absolve from sin; thus they open the kingdom of heaven and bring believers in. They are far different from those to whom the Lord said: "Wo unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in, ye hindered." Luke 11: 52. When the ministers proclaim the Gospel, and the forgiveness of sins contained in it, which is promised to all believers and baptized persons, *and announce that it pertains to each one*, they rightly and really absolve them. We are not of opinion that this absolution becomes any more effectual by being whispered into the ear or upon the head of the individual. But we hold, that the forgiveness of sins in the blood of Christ, must be diligently proclaimed to men, and that the individuals must be exhorted that the forgiveness of sins concerns them. For the rest, the evangelical examples teach us how diligent and careful the penitent must be in the new work, and in the mortification of the old and the vivification of the new man. The Lord said to the man whom He had healed of the palsy, (John 5: 14), and to the pardoned adulterous woman (John 8: 11): "Go thy way and sin no more." By these words, He did by no means affirm that a man could be

free from sin while he lives in the flesh, but he commends watchfulness and an earnest care, that we should endeavor by all means, and beg of God by prayer, that we do not again fall into the sin out of which we have just arisen, as it were, and that we be not overcome of the devil, the world and our flesh. Zaccheus, the publican, when he had experienced the grace of the Lord, (Luke 19: 8), cried out: "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore him four-fold." In like manner we preach the duty of restitution, and of mercy, and of giving alms, as necessary to the truly penitent. And generally, we exhort all with the Apostle: "Let not sin reign in your mortal body," &c. Rom. 6: 12, 13.

Therefore we condemn all the ungodly sayings of some, who misuse the evangelical doctrine and say: To return to God is easy. Christ has paid for all sins. The forgiveness of sins is easy. What will it hurt to sin? We need not be greatly concerned about repentance, &c.

But nevertheless, we always teach, both that an approach to God stands open to all, and that He forgives believers all their sins, with the exception of the sin against the Holy Ghost. Mark 3: 28, 29; Matt. 12: 31, 32; 1 John 5: 16.

Hence we reject the old and new Novatians and Catharists; but especially do we condemn the Pope's gain-seeking doctrine of penance, and against his simony and simoniack indulgences we make use of the sentence of Peter over Simon, Acts 8: 20, 21, "Thy heart is not right in the sight of God." We also condemn those who think they can make sufficient satisfaction for their sins by their own works. For we read that Christ alone, by his death and passion, is the satisfaction, propitiation and purging of all sins. Isa. 53: 4. Nevertheless, we do not cease to insist upon the mortification of the flesh, and add yet further, that it must not be proudly claimed before God as a satisfaction for our sins, 1 Cor. 8: 8; but it must be performed humbly, as becomes the children of God, as a new obedience and thankfulness for the redemption and full satisfaction obtained by the death of Christ.

J. H. G.

---

If along with prayer we will do all we can to fulfill our own petitions, God will never fail to do what may be lacking.



## WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

SOME things said and done, or threatening to be done of late, are of so peculiar a character as to excite special attention, to call for some special explanation, and possibly to demand something more. They are sayings, or doings, or both, which are very *significant in themselves*, particularly at this time, that is in January, 1873, which immediately followed December, 1872, the month during the first week of which the most important business of the last General Synod was transacted. They are sayings and doings very significant, in view of their obvious intention, and the influence they are meant to exert. They are still more significant in the boldness, perhaps one might say the audacity, with which they assail, denounce, and asperse certain objects which are thought offensive, and certain acts which seem to be unpalatable to the writers or doers of the things referred to. And once more they are notable, as proceeding from what seems to be covered with the softest wool of a sheep's clothing—anger muttered through smiles, like thunder rolling through a clear sky—reminding us of a captain of the war of 1812, whom we knew in our student days at Mercersburg, who always laughed the louder the more furious he was, and seemed to lay on the lash of his wrath in fun.

But let us explain ourselves. This may be done best by some

*Reminiscences.*

After the General Synod of Dayton, 1866, our Nevinite friends and Dr. Fisher of the *Messenger*, were all aglow with gratitude and joy. Then the General Synod was a great institution. With the exception of "a contemptible faction" from the East, joined by "a clique" from the West, a few "cyphers" from North Carolina, the Synod was represented and lauded as made up of earnest, learned, dignified delegates, who wisely understood their duty, and discharged that duty most faithfully. The results achieved at that Synod, and its decisions, were praised in terms of warm commendation, as most wise, salutary and comforting, and the Synod was held up as an object of admiration, worthy to be had in most respectful remembrance. Strong stress was laid upon the solemn obligations of the whole church, ministers and all, to bow in reverend obedience to its acts, and to acquiesce in loyal un-

murmuring submission to its sacred or sacramental authority. To complain of what had been done, to fret under it, to oppose it, was condemned, openly or impliedly, as nothing short of rebellion, sedition, factiousness, crime deserving the severest censure, and the sorest ecclesiastical discipline.

Hardly had the vote been taken on one of the main items before the Dayton Synod, when the result (a Nevinite ritualistic victory gained, no matter now by what means, by a majority of *five* in some 200 votes), was telegraphed to the Philadelphia papers as a splendid triumph for New Orderism. The telegram was sent by a reverend delegate who has since then discarded the General Synod of the Reformed church, discarded the church itself and his ordination in it, and, yielding to tendencies then naturally at work in him as an ardent Nevinite, gone over to extreme high-church Episcopacy, (Dr. Giesy).

Such were the feelings, sentiments and utterances of our Nevinite friends and Dr. Fisher, in December, 1866, and January, 1867, in regard to the General Synod.

*Three years later*

A similar happy frame of mind showed itself, and, like declarations regarding the highest judicatory of the church, were indulged. The General Synod of Philadelphia (1869) had been held. Its approach had been thought of with anxiety and alarm. A majority of the delegates elected to it were known to be unfavorable to the high-church views and schemes of the Mercersburg-Lancaster party. The leaders of that ritualistic party, who seem to regard their peculiar theology of more account than the principles and faith of the Reformed church, and to have more concern for the success of their New Order innovations than for the prosperity of our Zion—those leaders were trembling with apprehensions for the result of the coming meeting. This terror was betrayed in several remarkable articles published in the *Messenger* in advance of the assembling of the Synod. In those articles, among other things, there were some ominous hints and suggestions regarding the real character and authority of that body, and the desirableness of dissolving or abolishing it, in case certain things should be done. An attempt was made to prepare the minds of at least some of the delegates, for a possible rupture, or some sort of a

nullification movement, as though such a movement might be justifiable on the part of the high-church wing, if the General Synod should go against their measures.

The Synod convened. By some means or other the Nevinites secured a majority, and obtained control of the actions of the body. This produced a manifest and marvellous change for the better in those who thus found themselves in the ascendant. Now the General Synod was all right. Its powers were such as the supreme judicatory of the church should possess. Its acts deserved the most devout respect of every delegate, and of the entire church. Its voice was to be heeded as the voice of God—for it spoke the language and served the principles of Lancaster.

It is interesting to turn back and read what the organ of that party says about the General Synod of Philadelphia.

In an editorial (Dr. Fisher's), of the *Messenger* of December 15, 1869, we find such passages as these:

"The meeting was looked forward to with more than usual interest and importance (?) in its bearing upon the future of the Reformed church in the United States. This expectation was well founded."

"The proceedings were marked for their dignity and decorum. \* \* Although overruled by the majority, and perhaps to some extent disappointed in their expectations, *the minority in each case seemed to acquiesce in the will of the majority*; and we trust all returned to their respective fields of labor, determined, by the grace of God to continue, and, if possible, increase their activity in behalf of the interests of their Redeemer's kingdom."

This is very pleasant reading. It was no doubt very pleasant for Dr. F. to write thus, after things had gone so much according to his mind, or rather, perhaps, we should say, according to the mind of the Lancaster-Mercersburg party—for Dr. F. claims to be neutral. It was very good and nice, too, for him to write so loyally in regard to the General Synod of Philadelphia.

But he says more, and in the same vein: "If the ministry and membership of the church, *laying aside unnecessary controversy and agreeing to bear and forbear in regard to matters about which there will necessarily be a diversity of sentiment*, will give themselves up wholly and earnestly to labor in behalf of the common interests of the church, *abiding peace and continued prosperity* may be most confidently expected. This, we trust, all are most heartily dis-



posed to do; and we may, therefore, confidently hope that unmistakable expression will soon be given of the fact. At all events, *we shall in every way we legitimately can, labor to bring about a consummation so devoutly to be wished; and in this, also, we hope to receive a hearty and general concurrence and cöoperation.*"

This, all will admit, is very fine, at least as to substance; especially the last sentence. Clearly, the gratified writer thought then, that it was the plain and bounden duty of every "obedient son" of the church, to render unhesitating assent to the acts of the highest judicatory of the church. Had any one spoken or written disparagingly, or in terms of reprobation of what the Synod in question had done, he would doubtless have been ready to inflict the severest rebukes upon the offender. He has often expressed himself very warmly and strongly against even comparatively inoffensive objections uttered against the acts of an inferior court, and sanctioned violent attempts to impose extreme penalties upon those who have simply reported some facts concerning what such courts had done.

So far, then, the General Synod was all right in the judgment of Nevinites and Dr. Fisher. By adroit and ambiguous reports, that party had formally gained their point, or seemed to gain it, and they had secured action which could be interpreted in their favor.

*A sudden change,*

However, has taken place in this respect. Another General Synod has been held. In form, character, constitutional authority, title to reverence and respect, it has precisely the same claims as any previous General Synod. The delegates composing it, possess the same official character. It is as truly the highest judicatory of "the Reformed church in the United States." Matters of as grave importance as any disposed of by any previous General Synod, and of far greater practical significance and effect, were adjudicated. There are as good reasons for cheerful and obedient acquiescence, viewed from the Nevinite theory of church authority, to its decisions, as to those of any former Synod.

But somehow those now in the minority, (at least many of them), that is Dr. F.'s special friends, cannot see the General Synod of Cincinnati in the same pleasant light in which they saw its predecessors. Dr. F.'s glasses, especially, appear to have changed color,

so that all now seems to him to wear a greenish-yellow hue. Something within compels him to write about that Synod, and to write more than he did about the others. He writes, however, in an altogether different spirit and strain. The homilies and exhortations of other days, commending a loyal submission, peaceful acquiescence, and the like, to the decisions of the church, seem all to be lost upon himself and forgotten. Such virtues might do very well for others to practice, but he and his friends seem to have no idea of exemplifying the virtues themselves. Only mark

*What the Messenger says*

Of the General Synod of the Reformed church in the United States, in 1872-3, and contrast it with the former utterances of the same paper.

In a previous editorial, the writer had put himself under restraint, and no fault could be found with what was said. But as he mused, the fire burned. All restraint and respect for the Synod are cast aside, and utterance is given to such language as this:

With reference to the deliberations of the General Synod, which led to the decision reached in the *Super Appeal* case, Dr. Fisher says: "A *calm, careful, unbiased* consideration of the points properly at issue, was *wholly out of the question*. No presentation of facts, or power of argument, could possibly change the current of things. *The forces had been mustered* to save their religious rights and liberties, which they were led to believe were in jeopardy, and *the specific purpose for which they had been rallied, must be carried out at all hazards*." (See *Messenger* of December 25th, 1872.)

This, plainly, is nothing else than the description of a *mob*. All the blindness, ignorance and fanaticism of a mob meeting, are here ascribed to the body to which the article of Dr. Fisher refers. It was brought together, rallied according to his account, as mobs are rallied. It was ruled by the unreasoning and unreasonable madness by which mobs are swayed. It swept along in its tumultuous current, regardless of facts and arguments (such as Dr. Fisher assumes his calm, and dignified, and dispassionate, and learned Nevinite friends presented in due force), wildly bearing all down before it, and furiously intent of securing its purpose "at all hazards," just as do excited mobs. "*At all hazards*," not caring

what became of truth, no matter how cruelly righteousness might suffer, utterly pitiless of the wounds inflicted upon the cause and true church of the Lord Jesus Christ—precisely as does an infuriated mob! And by this *mobism* the General Synod was ruled from first to last, in all it did in the case in question! So says Dr. Fisher. And he says it through the columns of the *Messenger*—the great *authorized* organ of his party in the Eastern Synod. As far as that *Messenger* went (happily, indeed, not very far), it proclaimed this testimony to the church. Whoever believes what it says, will believe, that in this matter, at least, *the General Synod of the Reformed church in the United States, convened in Cincinnati, was little if any better than a mob.* And such shameful language, such insulting words, are heaped upon the Synod after an assurance had been given in the beginning of the article, that any comments which might be indulged on the doings of the Synod, should be made in “*a becoming Christian spirit,*” and should avoid “*all offensive personalities, as well as criminations in every form!*”

Surely, the editor of the *Messenger* must have very different notions of what belongs to a “becoming Christian spirit,” from those which most *gentlemen* entertain; and his ideas of “criminating personalities” must be as perverted as his conceptions of truth, after the first visit to North Carolina!

But the crimination of persons involved in his statements, is insignificant in comparison, with their gross calumniations of the General Synod. For all their vituperation applies directly, not to the individuals, as such, who made up the mob, but to the body which was collectively constituted of and by those individuals as its majority, and whose acts were the very things “*carried out at all hazards.*”

Take another specimen. In a ribald article by Dr. T. G. Apple, admitted into the *Messenger* December 18th, 1872, on the same subject, after speaking in disparaging and contemptuous terms of the General Synod at Cincinnati, the writer indulges in such utterances as the following:

“The position taken by the Synod can present a shadow of justification, only as it is regarded *as a war measure*, and in a time when self-defence may seem to require *a setting aside of constitutional order.* The West were *wheeled unto line* to protect the minority in the Eastern Synod. *And they did it with a rush.*”  
 “The General Synod has been turned into an organ by which the



West can come in and support a minority, *no matter how disorderly*, in the Eastern Synod."

"We believe the workings of the General Synod exert a demoralizing influence in the church, and in that view we would be better off without it." "We can scarcely conceive of anything more ungrateful, and more outrageous, than the Western Germans lending themselves to break down the authority of the Eastern Synod. They have taught us a lesson."

In saying these shameful, "*outrageous*" things, Lancaster Nevinism has, through Dr. Apple, sown the wind, and may expect to "reap a whirlwind."

But turn again to Dr. Fisher. In his paper of January 15, 1873, he affirms that "the point decided by the General Synod, was based upon a misconception and misconstruction of the nature of the action of the (Eastern) Synod." "The action of the (General Synod) is calculated to open the door to all kinds of lawlessness, in regard to teaching theology. Seed has been sown which is likely to bring forth much evil fruit \* \* \* which must be disastrous to the best interests of the Reformed church."

Let these unpleasant quotations suffice to show the exceedingly bad temper and spirit of the criticisms which Dr. Fisher & Co. have allowed themselves to indulge in, upon the character, and some of the principal proceedings of the late General Synod. And they have been indulged not under any exasperation felt at the time when the Synod was held, or its deliberations and acts transpired. They were written and published after weeks had passed, and those weeks of the coldest weather ever experienced in this latitude, cold enough to have sufficiently chilled the glow of indignation or chagrin felt at any disappointment of cherished expectations, or frustration of malevolent designs.

*What, now, does all this mean?*

The question arises naturally. It is proper to ask it, and especially so under all the circumstances of the case. And it will be right to answer the question according to the facts above given, judged in the clear light of all those circumstances.

What then does it mean that Nevinism, speaking through its great and obsequious organ, feels authorized to use language in regard to the General Synod of Cincinnati, so different from that employed in regard to former General Synods? What does it

mean, that whilst it formerly preached the doctrine of respectful deference for Synodical authority, particularly the authority of the Eastern Synod, it can now give vent to abusive vituperation, and to shameful calumnies upon the late General Synod?

Our answer must be, of course, according to our own judgment in the case, but that judgment, we believe, will be found fully warranted by facts.

*False Pretences.*

In the *first place*, it means that *all the loud protestations heretofore made by those* who are guilty of these calumnies, in regard to the sacred character of ecclesiastical judicatories, and the respect and obedience due to their acts and decisions, *were but hollow partisan pretences*. So long as they could sway a majority in Synods, and use them for the purpose of executing their partisan, revolutionary purposes, those Synods were invested with high authority, their voice was to be heeded as the very voice of God himself, (such has been their own language). Then no one might say aught, however respectfully, in the way of dissent from their decisions, or of disapproval of their acts, without being denounced as seditious rebels, and threatened with heavy ecclesiastical penalties. Dr. Fisher himself, has more than once uttered such menaces.

In one case, of which some more conscientious and Christianly sensitive brethren were afterwards ashamed, he connived at something closely allied to a conspiracy, to ostracise a brother, (a hair of whose head he has since pleasantly declared he would not hurt), against whom a false case was manufactured, in order to procure his ecclesiastical condemnation. In that case, the alleged offence was, that the alleged offender had outrageously maligned the Eastern Synod, by reporting one of its doings, and saying that "such a thing was unknown among secular politicians." The unrighteous scheme was foiled, but Dr. Fisher was so zealous for the honor of his Synod, that he did his best (or worst) to keep the church from knowing the truth in the case.

But now, such is his anger against the lately convened *highest* judicatory of the church, that he can cast upon it the most odious epithets, and charge it with having been no better than a *mob*. And he is allowed, by his party, to do this without the slightest rebuke. They seem to endorse and approve of his ribald assault upon the Synod.

Are only Nevinite Synods sacred? Are Synodical acts and decisions to be treated with deference, and spoken of respectfully, only when they express the decrees of the Lancaster Sanhedrim, or serve to promote the ritualistic innovations and Romanizing schemes gendered in that womb, and springing from that nest?

If that party is sincere in holding its ultra high-church views of church authority, let its leaders be consistent, and its abettors prove themselves as ready to bow to such authority when it thwarts their measures, as when it may be made, in form and in appearance at least, to favor and promote them. If the quotation above made mean anything, they demonstrate that Nevinism has no sincere respect for Synods, as such.

*Deception.*

In the *next place*, the course adopted by the party in question, as betrayed by its leading exponents, can mean nothing else than *deception*. The entire bearing and influence of the articles in the *Messenger*, is to mislead, confuse and deceive the minds of readers in regard to the character of the General Synod at Cincinnati, its proceedings, and its acts. That Synod, as far as the majority representing it officially, is concerned, was far less under the influence of political manœuvring and tactics, than the Nevinite leaders are accustomed to employ in their schemes. To represent it as "rallying of forces," and "wheeling into line" of the "foreign Germans," and "the West," is an utterly false representation, and serves only to remind one of the way in which Drs. Apple, Fisher, and others have heretofore managed to carry points, under disguise, for ritualism. Those who have charged such things upon the Cincinnati Synod, *know* that they apply with far less truth to that Synod than to themselves, in their movements in the Eastern Synod. They know that the mass of the delegates at Cincinnati who constituted the overwhelming majority there (not of 5 or 7, but of 22 votes), voted more in intelligent accordance with their own real sentiments, than there is reason to fear many of the Elders on the other side, whose votes were controlled by their ministers. And there is ground for the further belief, that those majority delegates, in voting as they did, more fully and truly represented the views and convictions of their constituents, than did many of those who voted with the Nevinite minority; and we have a strong impression that Drs. Apple, Fisher,



&c., think so, too. It seems hardly credible that they should not know that the great body of the church East is opposed to their ritualistic scheme in general, theology and all, and to the practical application of their high-church principles, in such matters as were decided by the Cincinnati Synod in particular.

But if this be so, then what else can the policy of the *Messenger*, in its assaults upon the General Synod, mean else than an attempt to deceive, by making impressions upon people contrary to the facts in the case, and leading them to regard the action at Cincinnati as secured by foul means, through the blind and stupid excitement of "the foreign Germans" and others who were phrenzied into voting against the Eastern Synod?

*Factionousness.*

In the *third* place, the course pursued by the *Messenger*, means *factionousness*, and factionousness betraying itself in such calumnious antagonism to the General Synod, as in no case ever characterized any dissent in the East from various extreme and unconstitutional proceedings of the Eastern Synod. The *Messenger* has been very loud and bitter in its denunciations of factionousness in the East. But now it can seek to foment it in its worst form, against the highest judicatory of the church, and by indulging in representations which not only really "appeal to the worst passions" of a party which has shown itself most unhappily susceptible of being so aroused, but which appeal to them by the use of most offensive and insulting misrepresentations.

*Renewed Plotting.*

This is the *fourth* evil thing involved in the policy avowed by the *Messenger*. The *failure* of the scheme to crush out evangelical opposition to the Mercersburg-Lancaster measures for subverting our Reformed faith and worship, by the boldly violent assault made by leaders of the party last fall, is not to be submitted to as final. That failure may, in their opinion, have resulted from too open and direct an exposure of the spirit and the purposes of the party, or from some lack of previous vigilance and scheming. There appears to have been a miscalculation of the effect of certain previous correspondence and arrangements, upon "the foreign Germans." All this must be corrected by the time of the next General Synod. How this is to be done, is but darkly hinted.

Some of the means to be employed, may, however, be easily surmised from what is known of the manœuvring skill of certain leaders of the ritualistic party, and from what they have done in the past. We do not feel called upon to forecast the probable measures. Enough, that under an excitement of passion, the *Messenger* has forewarned the church of what may be expected. Being thus forewarned, the true friends of the church will probably take care to be forearmed.

All that the revolutionizing party has achieved in the past, has been gained by scheming. And it owes its unenviable success largely to the undue confidence of the church in avowals of loyalty, and indignant denials of charges of error and hurtful plans, made against the leaders of the party. The day of that misplaced confidence is past. And those deluded by it have learned somewhat from dearly-earned past experience.

*War.*

Finally, the assaults of the *Messenger*, and the party it represents, upon the action of the General Synod in the matters most disliked, mean *war*. All its past pleas for peace, seem to have been mere pretences. By peace, it meant nothing more than that those who could not in conscience approve of the New Order theology, and its schemes upon the church, should quietly submit to the innovations, however subversive of our church principles and life they might be, and that Nevinism should be allowed peaceably to pursue its revolutionary Romanizing measures. Opponents to those measures were disturbers of the sweet peace of the church, "troublers in Israel," who should be silenced, disciplined and condemned.

Now, however, the *Messenger* is for *war*. The defeat of its party at Cincinnati, has totally changed its mind on the subject of peace. Its martial spirit has been fixed, and it burns for warfare against the decisions of the last General Synod, determined to conquer or to die. And the war is to be urged to the bitter end. Better fight until the General Synod is destroyed, and the unity of the church represented by it perishes, than endure quietly what was done at Cincinnati. "The foreign Germans," especially, must be taught better manners than to dare to withstand or hinder the schemes of the high-church party, which is claimed to have so warmly and liberally befriended them.

So, then, the conflict must go on, and now with renewed vigor. It seems to be thought better that the church should go down, than that the schemes of Nevinism should be thwarted. This is not hard to understand. The declaration is plain and unmistakable. It is, in fact, only a more frank avowal of what we have long believed to be the ruling sentiment and purpose of the party. Now we know it from its own mouth, and that from the mouth of two or three, at least, of its leading witnesses. Well, if it must be so, let it come. The Reformed church has triumphed over many a foe, and, doubtless, the Lord will give her the victory over this new assailant upon her proper faith and life.

But what shall be thought of Dr. Fisher and the *Messenger* taking such a stand, assuming such a position, after all that has been declared and pledged by the *Messenger* in years gone by? Who can estimate or portray the ridiculous inconsistencies betrayed by the contrast between its present course and former avowals of pious deference to Synodical authority and official acts of the church? If this is the meaning of his "*Mittelmass die beste Strass*," then Mittelmass signifies what no upright, straightforward Christian man will care to adopt as the rule of his conduct, or as the course of his private or public life. For it has most wretchedly betrayed the editor of the *Messenger* into doing and conniving at what must justly fall under the condemnation of all right-thinking members of the church, and merits the severest censure of the Synod which has been so unblushingly maligned.

---

At the completion of its fiftieth year, in 1866, the American Bible Society resolved to "undertake without delay a third general supply of the whole country with the word of God." For six years that work has been quietly going on, in which time more than three and a-half millions of families have been visited with the offer of the Scriptures; about one-tenth of whom, or 356,918, are reported to have been found without any copy of the Bible, and of these, 270,266 were supplied by sale or gift, besides about 230,000 individuals not identified with families in the returns.



## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

### MASTER YOUR OWN LANGUAGE.

YOUR nation is the American. Your language is the English. It matters not how old this is, or how heavily freighted with literature it may or may not be. The place of its birth is unimportant. Sufficient, that it is your language.

And yet you say, what of it?

It is the language in which your country's laws are written, your Bible is printed, and your people speak.

It is the language of a mighty nation, your own; of a sister Empire, the British; and, within their limits, a hundred million people communicate their thoughts by means of it. Wherever a ship touches land, and goods are bartered, there it is spoken.

It has age. Some words, now in daily use, were heard by Cæsar and his companions, in the eastern portion of England, a half century before the Christian era.

It has a literature. Chaucer, Spencer, Dryden, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and their great compeers, have laden it with the spoils of thought for centuries.

In idiom it is various and rich. In its vocabulary are found upwards of 114,000 words.

Through its medium you may acquaint yourself with every science and every art necessary for man's happiness.

Freedom and the highest degree of Christian civilization are the inheritances of all who claim it as their own.

Now you ask: how shall I master it?

In this way, pass no word by without learning its meaning; and of the words you use constantly learn the most delicate shades of meaning.

Pronounce each word correctly, and according to some standard authority.

Read few books. Read them in a most thorough manner. Read with a dictionary of the language by your side.

Keep a practical English grammar near you, and practice daily, for a short time, on some peculiar forms, such as the irregular verbs, etc.

Work out such guides as these:

1. Never use in the perfect tenses, or passive voice, the form of the past tense for that of the past or perfect participle.

2. Never use a transitive for an intransitive verb, viz: set for sit, lay for lie.

3. Be careful to understand all about the subject and predicate, and how to limit the meaning of each. A knowledge of these lies at the very foundation of constructing or formulating sentences.

4. Keep all limiting words, phrases, or clauses, next to, or as near as possible to the words limited.

These are not all. There are many other guides which can be obtained from the study of English Grammar.

The study of pure German will greatly aid you. The study of Latin and Greek is necessary. Why? For discipline.

If trammelled by a dialect, quit the dialect. Do not pronounce a word of it. Do not use its words as instruments of thought. Forget it. Think in English. Speak English.

It is well to remember that more than one-half of the English vocabulary is made up of Saxon words, or words of Saxon origin. The remainder comes to us from Latin, Greek, and other European languages.

Saxons words are considered the most important. They form the purest idioms, and are the strength and life of the language. You should then read books written in the best Saxon English.

We mention a few. The king James' translation of the Bible is a fine specimen, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, Cowper's *Poems*, the works of Goldsmith and Washington Irving, are excellent.

R.

---

No man ever got stung by hornets who kept away from where they were. It is just so with bad habits.

## SILENT INFLUENCE.

As silently as the waters of the Mississippi flow into the Gulf of Mexico, increasing their volume without perceptibly changing their depth or breadth, and as the waters of the gulf again mingle with those of the ocean without visibly influencing its movements, so the silent influence of one man often flows into the actions of another, shaping his character, guiding and controlling his destiny, without perceptibly disturbing the current of his life. The influence, though great, comes so gradually and works so quietly, that those most intimate with him whom it affects, seldom perceive its workings, and frequently not even he in whom it occurs is conscious of its power. Personal influence works so secretly, so quietly and so gradually, yet so powerfully, that those exerting it are often no more aware that they are controlling in a great measure the actions of others, than those upon whom this influence is directly, or indirectly brought to bear, know that they are following the trail of light which some weary pilgrim through this vale of sorrow has left behind, as the sun in heaven leaves its trail of beautiful twilight after it sets in the west. Every man exerts a silent influence for good or for evil, that will not exhaust itself as long as this great globe revolves ; as long as time itself shall last.

This influence is operative upon those with whom he comes in personal contact, and even upon those whom he may never meet, and is measured by the character and ability of the person and by the estimation in which an individual is held by the community in which he resides, or by the public in general. There is no one so poor, no one so rich, no one so magnanimous, and no one so selfish that he does not influence some one for good or evil, that he does not strengthen a fellow man in his struggle of life, or weaken him in his endeavors to triumph over the ills which flesh is heir to. This influence has been at work between man and man ever since creation began, is at work to-day shaping the character of individuals, and directing the destinies of individuals and of nations. It silently undermines the most obstinate stubbornness, and from the most distorted material it may form the most beautiful characters, just as the skillful artist makes the most beautiful furniture out of the hardest wood, or the sculptor develops his Venus de Medici out of a piece of ungainly marble. We cannot stop this influence, it has an accumulated force of the ages past,



and in its onward march will sweep all tyranny, all idolatry, and every form of superstition and error from the face of the earth. America can attribute its position among nations to no other cause than the silent influence of liberty, which, animating every heart, from Bunker Hill to the utmost limits of the colonies, bore our forefathers through that revolution which was wasting this newly settled country's resources, draining her granaries, and drinking her young men's blood for eight long years before the freedom of which we to-day boast so proudly, was theirs; before the sun of liberty peered out from the dark cloud which overshadowed this land so long. It comes upon us in our slumbers, it steals warily upon us in the broad noonday's glare, and once within its grasp we cannot resist its giant hold. Among those who exert influence in a greater degree than men in general, and whose position in society places upon them a great responsibility, there is no one to whom the first honor has been so universally conceded as to the educators of the land, and yet it is a lamentable fact that there could not have been selected a single class of respectable men so incompetent for the important part which the teachers of our schools hold, as are some who at times occupy the position. This is true not only of many teachers in our public schools, but sometimes too true of the instructors in seminaries and professors in colleges. There are many noble exceptions, however, who shed a lustre and dignity upon the profession, who exert an influence that, sown in the early life of a student, will bear fruit and ripen in mature years, when the mirth and frivolity of inconsiderate youth will be buried among the relics of the past. The silent power which our institutions of learning exert over the communities in which they are respectively situated, is in no way better shown than by the decided superiority of those cities and towns, boroughs and villages in which large universities of learning are, over those in which none or few are situated. The intelligence and liberality of those small villages in which our own two colleges are situated, can be attributed to nothing but the tacit influence which for the last twenty-five years has gone forth from their halls, dispelling the dark blots which so often radiate their darkness outward to the circumference of society. A good friend can be relied upon in the use of this prerogative, and no fear need be entertained that he will use his influence for disadvantage. He is considerate, and uses his judgment more than those who are in-

different or careless in their actions and conduct. The kind word, the sorrowful look, often check the erring course of another, and reclaim him just as he is entering an abyss which would receive him—only to become the receptacle of his corpse—disgraced by all the vices and sins which man could commit. How often has the influence of a mother—the kindest friend of all—recalled an erring son? How many prayers has she offered to regain a riotous and drunken child to a sense of manhood and duty. Even while her gambling son drinks still deeper of his cup of misery, a silent guardian angel is entwining her arms around him, and with supernatural strength bears him away, though swaggering the drunkard's gait; or cursing, the drunkard's prayer.

We die, but leave a silent influence behind us. The lips which the powerful hand of death seals, still speak in words of living accent. It is what a man was, that lives and acts after he is dead and gone from among the living. The sphere in which he acted, may have been a fireside or a kingdom, a village or a nation, a hamlet or a palace, but act he does, ceaselessly and forever. He does bequeath an influence to posterity which will perpetually repeat itself in showers of benedictions, or a curse which will multiply in accumulative evil. What man does, is acted on a stage of which all are spectators; and what he says, is transmitted to future ages; and what he is, influences and acts upon the rest of mankind; he cannot be neutral; living, he acts; dead, he speaks; and the whole universe is the mighty company, forever looking, forever listening, and forever recording the thoughts, the words, the deeds and passions of the man. By death, the friend with whom we often took counsel, has been removed from our midst; but the lessons which he taught, the grand sentiments that he uttered, still survive; his likeness still appears in the silence of eventide; and being dead, he yet speaks forcibly and eloquently in the light of morn and noon and eve. The tree falls in the forest; after ages, it is turned into coal; and now our fires burn the brighter because it grew, because it fell. We live, we die, but the good or evil we do, lives afterwards, and silently exerts its influence along succeeding years. Man cannot be a blank, he must be a blessing or a curse—as a blessing, shedding peace and prosperity over the length and breadth of the land; or as a curse, sending his poisonous blight over the counsels of the brave, and destroying the happiness of many peaceful homes.

Go forth, then, into the different spheres which you may be called to occupy in the employments and professions of life ; go forth into your homes, whether they are high or low places ; mix with the roaring convulsions of the crowd, mingle with the peace and quiet of the fireside, and ever carry with you a full determination, that you will ever radiate a beneficent influence upon your fellow-men.

J. A. S.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

COLLEGE ITEMS.—The opening of the *Winter Term* brought a handsome accession of more than a dozen new students, some of whom enter the regular College classes. As many of these accessions are of a permanent character, they increase the encouraging prospects of the Institution.

*An adjourned meeting of the Board of Directors* was held here on January 24th. The members of the Board show commendable zeal in working for the prosperity of the College, and take the liveliest interest in its welfare. Those present were cheered by the favorable condition of things, and in turn cheered the Faculty and students by their attendance. Several matters of importance were discussed and disposed of. Some reference was made to the efforts of a certain party to create prejudice against the Institution by a gross misrepresentation of it as being "irresponsible," wholly outside of the Reformed church, &c. It was believed, however, that all such efforts, from such a source, could have no other than an advantageous effect, and rather earned our thanks than reprobation. Some malevolence is the best advertisement a good article could get.

*Acknowledgments.*—Since our last acknowledgment, the following sums have been received and appropriated in aid of students pursuing a course of preparation for the ministry in Ursinus College, for which the donors will please accept sincere thanks.

Rev. W. Sorber, (Brownback's),.....	\$ 28.81
“ “ (Shenkel's), .....	14.46
Rev. S. Schweitzer, Lancaster co., .....	35.00



Rev. D. Ziegler, York,	16.00
Rev. E. J. Fogel,	100.00
Friends in Chambersburg,	26.00
Rev. George Wolff,	10.25
Rev. L. K. Derr,	30.00
Rev. H. Leiss,	31.45

## EDITOR'S DESK.

TO THE MANY FRIENDS who have remembered the *financial* wants of the *Monthly* by promptness in paying up their dues, we owe our sincere thanks. *If all who are in arrears will only follow this example, they will greatly relieve us of a burden which should not be allowed to press us. What each owes, is a small matter individually, but the aggregate is of great account in carrying on our work.* Send the amount in *postal orders on Philadelphia*, or in *bank checks*.

As an item of interest, we give the *yeas* and *nays* on the *Super Appeal* and the Dunn complaint cases.

On the Super-Appeal case, the appeal was sustained by 100<sup>5</sup> yeas to 78 nays, as follows:

YEAS—*Ministers*.—A. Spangler, A. Wanner, M. Bachman, F. A. Rupley, Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger, Dr. E. H. Nevin, D. E. Klopp, M. S. Rowland, G. Neeff, W. Sorber, J. C. Clapp, Dr. G. W. Welker, A. Lepp, W. McCaughey, I. H. Reiter, Dr. D. Winters, S. Mease, J. Richards, G. Z. Mechling, C. W. Hoyman, H. Williard, J. C. Henneman, S. C. Goss, J. Steiner, N. H. Loose, Dr. J. H. Good, Dr. G. W. Williard, W. H. Fenneman, H. Korthener, C. Schiller, P. Greding, H. Wilson, C. G. A. Hullhorst, C. G. Ziph, H. Hilbush, J. Schlosser, F. R. Schwedes, P. H. Dippell, W. B. Sandoe, P. Kohl, J. H. Klein, S. N. L. Kessler, C. T. Martin, P. Vitz, H. A. Muehlmeier, Dr. J. Bossard, J. Winter, D. Zimmerman, J. Klingler, A. Toensmeier, C. Schaaf, F. Forwick, A. Becker, C. H. Schoepfle. (54.)

*Elders*.—J. Beaver, S. R. Weaver, W. Shull, J. Wiest, (Zion's), H. Kefauver, J. Force, J. Wiest, (Phila.), W. Brownback, J. Smith, W. L. Graver, T. Ingram, M.D., S. M. Finger, S. Lantz, B. Kuhns, M. Marcus, J. Swander, D. W. Nieble, J. Haller, G. W. Tussing, P. Bugh, T. W. Chapman, D. Waltz, J. Bolender, P. Fry, H. Bacher, C. Myers, C. J. Geiger, M.D., C. Kratz, L. Zellner, J. Greenameier, R. Bell, E. Vordermark, W. Miller, P. Loose, J. W. Brown, G. Gerst, B. Overesch, E. F. Oslage, F. Stockmeyer, L. Kaltschmid, M. Mueller, J. J. Schäublin, L. Biehl, J. Dechow and J. Wentz, I. Zeichel. (46.)

NAYS.—*Ministers*.—N. S. Strassburger, S. A. Leinbach, A. J. G. Dubbs, I. K. Loos, Dr. B. Bausman, I. E. Graeff, D. B. Albright, T. C. Leinbach, Dr. J.

O. Miller, J. S. Foulk, J. S. Kieffer, W. Goodrich, E. R. Eschbach, G. H. Martin, S. K. Kremer, J. A. Peters, P. S. Davis, Dr. E. E. Higbee, A. C. Whitmer, W. M. Deatrich, T. O. Stem, G. W. Aughinbaugh, L. D. Laberman, L. J. Mayer, Dr. E. V. Gerhart, W. H. H. Snyder, F. Pilgram, C. U. Heilman, J. W. Steinmetz, C. S. Gerhard, H. Mosser, D. M. Wolf, J. K. Millets, W. H. Groh, C. Cort, F. C. Bauman, G. M. Albright, J. G. Shoemaker, J. Fundeling, J. Kretzing, J. I. Swander, J. F. Snyder, W. Rupp, A. B. Koplin, G. B. Russell, T. J. Barkley, J. A. Hoffheins, J. E. Hiester, M. Bachman, Dr. Appél, G. Z. Mechling, H. Hilbish, Dr. J. Bossard.

*Elders.*—G. H. Stem, J. K. Dech, J. T. Reber, S. Withers, J. Rodenmayer, G. Harbaugh, W. H. Bargett, J. Heyser, G. H. Mengel, I. M. Neff, J. L. Reifsnnyder, D. B. Mauger, H. Weisel, P. B. Lerch, D. Appenzeller, W. M. Nevin, E. J. Zahm, W. H. Seibert, H. Rupp, J. Hoffer, J. Frederick, H. Witmer, S. Wildasin, D. Cort, A. Wiant, C. M. Boush, G. Bair, W. R. Barnhart, P. Hay, S. G. Lohr, T. J. Craig and J. Greenamier.

The above record shows that 52 delegates from the Eastern Synod voted *nay*, and 27 of the same Synod voted *aye*. That is, more than one-third of the delegates from the Eastern Synod voted against the action of that Synod at Martinsburg. This is very significant under the circumstances, and proves that the opposition to Nevinism in the Eastern Synod, where it has any opportunity of expressing itself, is by no means so contemptible as is often represented. Had that opposition a fair opportunity of making itself felt at Synod, it would show a decided majority even in the Eastern Synod.

The *Dunn* complaint was sustained by a vote of 90 yeas to 85 nays, as follows :

*YEAS.—Ministers.*—A. Spangler, A. Wanner, F. A. Rupley, Dr. Bomberger, Dr. Nevin, D. E. Klopp, M. S. Rowland, G. Neeff, W. Sorber, J. C. Clapp, Dr. Welker, A. Lepp, D. Van Horn, I. H. Reiter, Dr. Winters, J. Richards, S. Mease, H. Williard, J. C. Henneman, G. H. Meiboom, S. C. Goss, J. Steiner, Dr. Good, Dr. Williard, W. H. Fenneman, H. Korthener, C. Schiller, P. Greding, H. Wilson, C. G. A. Hullhorst, C. G. Ziph, J. Schlosser, F. R. Schwedes, P. H. Dippell, W. B. Sandoe, P. Kohl, J. H. Klein, S. N. L. Kessler, P. Joerries, P. Vitz, H. A. Muhlmeir, D. Zimmerman, J. Klingler, J. F. H. Dieckman, A. Toensmeier, C. Schaaff, F. Forwick, A. Becker, C. H. Schoepfle.

*Elders.*—J. Beaver, S. R. Weaver, W. Shull, J. Wiest, (Zion's), J. Force, H. Kefauver, J. Wiest, (Phila.), W. Brownback, J. Smith, W. L. Graver, T. Ingram, S. M. Finger, S. Lantz, B. Kuhns, M. Marquis, J. I. Swander, J. Haller, G. W. Tussing, P. Bugh, T. W. Chapman, D. Waltz, J. Bolender, P. Fry, H. Bacher, C. Myers, C. Kratz, L. Zellner, R. Bell, E. Vordermark, W. Miller, P. Loose, J. Zechiel, J. W. Brown, B. Overesch, E. F. Oslage, F. Stacksmeier, L. Kaltschmitt, M. Mueller, J. J. Schaublin, L. Biehl, J. Dechow.

*NAYS.—Ministers.*—N. S. Strassburger, S. A. Leinbach, A. J. Z. Dubbs, I. K. Loos, Dr. Bausman, I. E. Graeff, J. E. Hiester, D. B. Albright, T. C. Leinbach, Dr. J. O. Miller, J. S. Foulk, J. S. Kieffer, W. Goodrich, E. R. Eschbach, M. Bachman, G. H. Martin, S. K. Kremer, J. A. Peters, P. S. Davis, Dr. Higbee, A. C. Whitmer, W. M. Deatrich, T. O. Stem, G. W. Aughinbaugh,

L. D. Laberman, L. J. Mayer, Dr. Gerhart, Dr. Apple, W. H. H. Snyder, F. Pilgram, C. U. Heilman, J. W. Steinmetz, C. S. Gerhard, H. Mosser, D. M. Wolf, J. K. Millets, W. H. Groh, G. Z. Mechling, C. Cort, F. C. Bauman, H. Hilbish, G. M. Albright, Dr. J. Bossard, J. G. Shoemaker, J. Fundelings, J. Kretzing, J. I. Swander, J. F. Snyder, W. Rupp, A. B. Koplin, G. B. Russell, T. J. Barkley, J. A. Hoffheins.

*Elders.*—G. H. Stem, J. K. Dech, J. T. Reber, S. Withers, J. Rodenmayer, S. Harbaugh, W. H. Bargett, J. Heyser, G. H. Menzel, I. M. Neff, J. L. Reif-snyder, D. B. Mauger, H. Weisel, P. B. Lerch, D. Appenzeller, W. M. Nevin, E. J. Zahm, W. H. Seibert, H. Rupp, J. Hoffer, J. Frederick, H. Witmer, S. Wildasin, D. Cort, J. Greenamier, A. Wiant, C. M. Boush, G. Bair, W. R. Barnhart, P. Hay, S. G. Lohr, T. J. Craig.

A small volume of "*Devotions for Children*," is about being published by the Rev. F. Strassner, of Orrville, Ohio, as we learn from a private source. It will consist of *prayers, hymns, &c.*, and promises to be a book well-suited to the purpose, and is expected to be ready by April. In order to place it within the reach of all, the price will be moderate. Our personal knowledge of the compiler and publisher, warrants the hope that it will be found useful and calculated to do much good. The price will be: 1 copy 25 cts. Per doz. \$2.25. Per 50 copies \$8.50. Per 100 \$16. Address Rev. F. Strassner, Orrville, Wayne county, Ohio.

The great importance and interest of the late General Synod justifies our giving to it so much space at present in the pages of the *Monthly*. And the violent assaults made upon it by the *Messenger* renders our course in this respect the more justifiable. It is gratifying to learn that the friends of the *Monthly* are of the same mind with ourselves upon this point. Altogether the spirit betrayed by the *Messenger* is most reprehensible, as well as glaringly inconsistent with earlier protestations of profound loyalty to the judicatories of the church.

"*Der Evangelist*," of Cleveland, Ohio, edited by Rev. P. Greding, of New Philadelphia, has been giving its readers some exceedingly interesting and able articles on the General Synod of Cincinnati. Its vindication of the position maintained there by the majority of the German delegates, against the aspersions of Drs. Apple and Fisher, is thorough as it is pungent. Among other things the editor admits that there were heart-burnings among those who strove, at the General Synod, to defend the action of the Martinsburg Synod, because of their defeat. But he suggests that those heart-burnings were not like the sensations of the disciples on their way to Emmaus, inasmuch as the Martinsburg delegates had not as good company as those disciples enjoyed. The editor also maintains that his German brethren at the General Synod knew what they were doing, and had courage to vote according to their convictions, never having bartered their consciences for eastern high-church silver. The editor also gives a synopsis of his able refutation (though, modestly, does not mention it as his), of Dr. Gerhart's feeble and erroneous argument to show that in the Reformed church authority, power descends from the Synods to the



people, instead of from the people, that is the church, to the Synods, which was shown by brother Greiding, to be the true Reformed doctrine.

*In the March No. of the Monthly*, the articles on the Synod and the Second Helvetic Confession will be continued, and the first of a short historical series on the North Carolina churches be published.

BOOK NOTICES are unavoidably deferred to the March number.

## MONTHLY SUMAMRY.

### REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH.—*Ministerial changes:*

Rev. J. M. Titzel, from Emmitsburg, Md., to *Irwin*, Westmoreland co., Pa.

Rev. J. W. Ebbinghaus, from Washington, D. C., to Allegheny, Pa.

Rev. J. Schlusser, from Plymouth, Ind., to Three Rivers, Mich.

Rev. H. Bielsfield, from Harrisburg to Frederick, Md.

Rev. H. Miller, from Adamstown to Waynesboro, Franklin co.

Rev. C. Lienkemper, from Lowell, Wis., to Waukon, Allamakee co., Iowa.

ADDITIONS TO CHURCHES.—Twenty persons were added to Beam's charge, Pa., Rev. H. F. Keener, pastor.

Eight persons were added to the Polk congregation, Ashland, Ohio.

Five persons were added to the Shelbyville congregation, Rev. H. Wilson, pastor.

Thirty persons were added to the First Church of Lebanon, Pa., Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, pastor.

Seventeen persons were added to the congregation at Bath, Pa., Rev. M. A. Smith, pastor.

Eight persons were added to the congregation at Hagerstown, Md., Rev. W. F. Colliflower, pastor.

Seventeen persons were added to the Heidelberg church, Philadelphia, Rev. W. C. Hendrickson, pastor.

Thirteen persons were added to Immanuel's Reformed church, Williamsport, Pa.

Eleven persons were added to Trinity church, Tamaqua, Pa.

Twenty-five persons were added to the church at Wooster, Ohio, Rev. A. F. Zartman, pastor.

Four persons were added to Christ church, Philadelphia, Pa., Rev. J. H. Dubbs, pastor.

Four persons were added to the congregation at Springboro, Ohio.

Ten persons were added to the Trinity Chapel congregation, Jefferson charge, Md., Rev. Simon S. Miller, pastor.

DEDICATION OF CHURCHES.—St. Luke's church, Martinsburg charge, was dedicated on the 28th of December.

The First Reformed church, of San Francisco, Cal., was dedicated on the 15th of December.

The Pisgah congregation, formerly connected with the Fairfield charge of Miami Classis, dedicated their new church edifice to the worship of the Triune God, on Sunday, November 17th, 1872. Rev. A. Howker is pastor.

The dedication of the new (S. S. and Lecture Room) Chapel of the First Reformed church of Lebanon, (Rev. Dr. Kremer, pastor), took place with appropriate solemnities on December 29th, 1872. Prof. Super, of Ursinus College, preached the English sermons on the occasion, and the Rev. Dr. Johnson, of St. John's Reformed church, with other clergymen of Lebanon, participated in the services. The occasion proved an edifying season for the congregation, and will doubtless serve to impart even increased energy to their well-known interest and zeal in matters pertaining to the kingdom of Christ. The new edifice was greatly needed for the accommodation of the large and flourishing Sunday-school, and will greatly add to the comfort of all connected with it.

OBITUARY.—The Rev. J. Lantz, of Taneytown, Md., was called to his rest, after a brief illness, on Monday, January 27th, in the 61st year of his age. He long labored in North Carolina, removed to Virginia about three years ago, and thence to Taneytown. He was a quiet but faithful workman.

MEXICO—*Sixty Protestant Congregations.* The free preaching of the Gospel in Mexico has produced such remarkable effects not only in the city, but in many parts of the country, that Ultramontane fanaticism is thoroughly aroused. A secret society, under the name of "Societad Catholica," has been formed for the purpose of opposing and suppressing, as far as possible, Evangelical teaching. In some places it has succeeded in dispersing Protestant congregations for a time, by violence and riots; but in almost every case the State authorities have reinstated the Protestants in their civil and religious rights. Occasionally the rebels made their rallying cry, "Death to the Protestants!" as they did at Tlalmanalco, where they were successful in routing the Government troops. Every effort is made by the Romanists, by means of "missions" or presbyters going about exhorting the people to confess, to counteract the circulation of the Bible, to destroy the influence of the "Church of Jesus," and by intimidating the people, threatening excommunication for reading Protestant books, commanding them to burn all they find, to arrest the progress of the Protestant movement.

But the work goes steadily forward. Congregations are springing up in various parts of the country—now at least sixty in number, varying in membership from ten to five hundred. On the last Sunday of the past year the Lord's Supper was publicly administered at St. Jose de Gracia, formerly a Roman Catholic church, by Rev. Dr. Riley, assisted by four converted priests, to about four hundred communicants. The Chapel of Balvanera, adjoining the church of San Francisco, is crowded with worshipers. A church has been planted at Guadalupe, the headquarters of the Mexican Papists, who attempted to drive away the encroaching Protestants, but were restrained by the Prefect of the city.—*London Exchange.*

ITALY—*The Work in Rome*: The Rev. James Walls writes in the *Baptist Missionary Herald*:

"The work here in Rome, which I have recently commenced, progresses gloriously. Our meeting at Traiana is full, and the meeting in my own house is full every night, *before the time appointed*. Last night, though this is the Carnival week, we had about one hundred and fifty persons in our rooms and round the doors, who listened with the greatest attention to the Gospel. I have reason to believe that some who attend have received the Lord Jesus. Last week Count —, a Liberal Catholic, came, for the first time, to our meeting; a day or two after he published a letter in one of the journals of Rome, and last night he returned to tell me that he had fully received the Gospel. During the last three months about one hundred persons have desired their names inscribed in the list of candidates for church membership in this meeting.

"The room in which I preach is too small. The heat is suffocating at present, and will, in a short time, be intolerable; and, of course, the congregations will decrease unless something be done to accommodate those who attend."

CHRISTIAN JEWS: Of 30,000 Jews living in London, 2000 are members of Christian churches. Of 18,000 in Berlin, 2000 are said to be converted; in the University, three years ago, 28 were Christian Jews. The total number of Jews in Europe is reckoned at 3,431,700, and of these 20,000 are reckoned as Christian converts. In the Episcopal church in England, one hundred ministers are said to be of Jewish birth.—*The Register*.

THE telegraph, last week, announced the death of Rev. Ralph Randolph Gurley, D.D., Honorary Secretary of the American Colonization Society and the eloquent and life-long advocate of the cause. Dr. Gurley, while yet a very young man, was sent to Liberia in 1824, commissioned by the government of the United States and the American Colonization Society to reorganize the colony and take measures for a more stable government. He was there only a short time, but he laid the foundation of a system that soon after resulted in the organization of the independent government which has been recognized by the leading powers and which has satisfactorily tested the ability of the African race to govern themselves and to command the respect of the world. Dr. Gurley's "Life of Ashmun" gave to him a literary reputation. It is one of the most fascinating biographies that we have ever read, written as with the pencil of a painter, instead of a pen.

THE Treasurer of the New York City Mission gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars—the proceeds of a fair promoted by two young ladies in East Orange, N. J. This money is to be used in aiding special cases among the poor in the 8th and 15th Wards. This is only an example of what a little zeal and industry may accomplish when the heart is engaged in work for Jesus and his cause. Why may not many young ladies in other places devote their leisure to some such praiseworthy object, and thereby do and get more than they can tell?



*Have rec'd nothing from Hassen.  
Thinks it pretty certain that  
body is liturgical.  
Take care of this till I come  
I am quite well. June 21<sup>st</sup>*

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.—MARCH, 1873.—No. 3.

LOOKING UNTO JESUS.

FROM what we said in the previous article on this subject, the reader will readily conclude that all *right looking unto Jesus* requires a *looking away* from all inferior objects. In the language of our Catechism, on another point, those who look for "their salvation and happiness to saints, to themselves, or anywhere else" than to Him, cannot be said to look unto Him at all. And the reason given for this, is forcible. For, although such may "boast of Him in words, yet in deeds they deny Jesus, the only deliverer and Saviour; for one of these two things must be true, that either Jesus is not a complete Saviour, or that they who, by a true faith receive this Saviour, must find all things in Him necessary to their salvation."

To look unto Him, therefore, is to look to Him alone, for all that is needed from a true and perfect Saviour. *As such*, He must be sought and trusted in, to the absolute exclusion of all other helpers. Jesus must have no rivals in the heart, no matter who may recommend them; not even though they may be set up and endorsed by the highest councils, or most arrogant rulers of an apostate or self-deluded church.

*This is to be done by Faith.*

The above point being settled, it may next be asked, how is the Christian pilgrim and soldier to look unto Jesus?

This question must be answered, in a *general* way, by saying,

that it must be done by *faith*. Christian faith, according to the Scriptures, is a full and perfect substitute *for all the organs of sense*, by which things earthly, material, and temporal are perceived and apprehended.

Faith supplies, and more than supplies, the place of seeing with the bodily eye, hearing with the ear, or grasping with the hand. It lifts the believer above all these senses, and makes him independent of them, excepting as lower means of leading the mind and heart to the exercise of such faith. It "*cometh by hearing*," but it is in its own nature more than hearing. For many who hear do not believe. And even when it comes by *hearing*, it does so because this organ of sense, being more nearly spiritual in its nature than any other, is the medium through which the gospel is preached," is made known to the mind and heart. Hence, even in this respect is "the truth in Jesus" heard, which is the effective means or instrument of the spirit in producing faith. The mere hearing of that truth never leads to faith. Only the spirit by the gospel works it in the heart.

As to seeing, with the bodily eye, being in every way inferior to faith, the significant declaration of the Saviour to doubting Thomas, will suffice: "Blessed are they who have not seen and yet believe."

#### *Reasons for This*

Are further *to be found in the very nature* and character of the *object* to whom we are admonished to look, as well as in the purposes for which He is to be "considered."

Jesus *cannot* be seen by the eye of sense. Even in his human nature, now glorified, He is not visible. Neither is there any true visible symbol or representation of Him, by contemplating which, He can be said to be seen. True, the Romish priest says: here is Christ, when he holds up the *host* in the mass, for adoration. And others say, there is Christ, directing all eyes to be turned towards the altar and its sacramental emblems with devoutest homage. But both grievously err, deceiving themselves, or at least deceiving others. He is neither *here* nor *there*, in any such outwardly visible sense. Hence our Reformed fathers, closely following the Scriptures, say in their old liturgy, (which the Synod of our church, at the commencement of the liturgical movement, ordered to be made the main guide in preparing a new liturgy),

that, in the supper of the Lord, the sincere communicant must not permit his heart to cleave to the bread and wine of the table, the sacramental elements, as though Jesus were somehow mysteriously mingled with them, *but* must lift them up in faith to heaven, where He sitteth at the right hand of the Father in glory.

Jesus, as Jesus, can be seen with true, effective discernment, *only by faith*. Only faith can recognize His true mediatorial character as prophet, priest and king. He can be truly presented to no organ of sense, either by picture, image, cross, or other symbol. Faith alone can lay hold of Him as the propitiation. Faith alone can see Him as "our Passover, sacrificed for us." Faith alone can discern the atoning efficacy of His vicarious passion and death. Faith alone can "know the power of His resurrection." There is nothing in Him, in any of these aspects, or offices, for any bodily organ to fasten upon. And whenever external, visible or sensible symbols, "signs or seals" are so exhibited and commended, as to lead any poor souls *to regard them as Him*, both the symbols and the souls are wretchedly abused, whilst Jesus Himself is wickedly dishonored.

*Another Reason*

For regarding *faith* as the only proper way of looking unto Jesus is, that *the benefits* to be bestowed by Him, and to be received by the Christian from Him, *are purely spiritual*. When Elijah lay faint and dying with *bodily* hunger, under the juniper tree, in the wilderness (1 Kings 19: 4, &c.), "the angel of the Lord" (was it God the Son Himself?) brought the starving prophet "a cake of bread, baked on coals, and a cruse of water." That was what he needed for his bodily hunger. It required material food for material physical strength. And Elijah took it with his hand, and ate it with his mouth. But, when the same Elijah needed spiritual strength, the Lord imparted, and the prophet received it in an entirely different way (see 1 Kings, 19: 9-18). The inner man cannot be fed and revived by external food. And the inner man must take and appropriate the inner spiritual food needed for the soul, by an organ, (so to speak), which is spiritual. Such spiritual food cannot be received into the soul in any other way. The Christian needs fortitude, patience, courage, confidence, hope. He can get these only from Jesus, by the Spirit. He must look to Jesus for them, and *receive* them from Him. How is he to look



for that which is invisible, but by that faith which alone can see such invisible blessings? How is he to lay hold of them, and appropriate them, but by a like faith, which is the substance of things hoped for? There is, ordinarily, no way for heavenly grace to the soul, but the way of faith.

*The True Jesus to be Looked Unto.*

In looking by faith unto Jesus, however, care must be taken to look unto Him *as He is*. But He is only what He represents Himself to be in the Gospel. *True* faith knows no other Jesus. The vain fancies and speculations of men may imagine, frame, and hold up their own conceits, and call them Jesus. But all such conceits are "false Christs." Beware of them. Go not after them. Do not fall down or worship them. They may be very finely described. Great swelling words, which make a learned sound, and have a show of profound philosophy, may be used in setting forth such vain human wisdom to the admiration of misled disciples. But Jesus is what He is, no less; no more. (He could not be more than *He is*), and not what dreamers may think He ought to be, and may try to prove Him to be. And though they may dream that they are magnifying Him by their conceits, they really take from Him His true excellence and glory, by every change they make in the clear Gospel exhibition of His person and character.

*This view of Jesus is to be found in the Gospel.*

The Christian must, therefore, look unto Jesus.

1. *As revealed in the Word, written or proclaimed.* To that he must go, first of all, to learn, not only who He is, and what He is, but to learn to know Him *as his own Jesus*. It is for this, largely, that "the gospel of Christ" has been provided. That Gospel is the only authoritative and trustworthy exhibition of Jesus in His person and work. In it the "great mystery of godliness, (that is, *piety* or true religion), God manifest in the flesh," is *revealed* to believers. And He is so plainly and clearly revealed, that "babes" in Christ can see Him, though He remains hidden from the carnal eyes of the worldly wise and learned. In the Gospel written, printed or preached, the sincere believer sees Jesus not as the Jews did, who "judged after the flesh," but as revealed

to loving faith in His true character, the Word became flesh, that He might be "the Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world." He hears Him speak as never man spake, and is quickened by the *gracious words* which proceed from His mouth. He sees His love and pity displayed in the wonders He wrought for the relief of human misery and wo. He beholds His meekness, patience, and lowliness of heart, amidst scorn, reproach, and cruel enmity. He gazes with melting eyes, by faith, and with intense anguish of soul, upon Him as He suffers and dies upon the cross. And the Holy Ghost (the comforter, the *Paraclete*) helps the believer as he thus looks unto Jesus to understand, apprehend what he sees by reading it or hearing of it, so that his heart may draw instruction, and comfort, and encouragement from it. In this way, by looking believably, the Christian "*considers*" the High-priest of his profession, the author (leader, captain,) and finisher of His faith; so that, instead of growing weary and faint in his mind, he may receive grace for grace, to strengthen him, and incite him to enduring perseverance in his course. By what is thus seen and learned, the believer's certain knowledge of Jesus is enlarged and confirmed, and his personal confidence in Jesus as his Saviour, able and willing to help him to the uttermost, is so increased and invigorated, that he feels constrained to follow Christ, and obtains power to do all things for Christ. Thus the person, life and example of Jesus become, through the Gospel, a moral and spiritual force in the soul of the Christian, as they are intended to be.

*Faith looks to Jesus Glorified.*

2. But the Gospel of Christ not only exhibits Him in His life of humiliation, as a stimulating pattern and a source of grace. It also affords a view of Him in that "glory which has followed the sufferings" of Jesus. Of course faith can truly see Him glorified, only to the extent to which the Scriptures reveal that glory. Enough, however, is thus revealed to enable faith to look unto Him as exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour; as seated at the right hand of God; as being our only Mediator there; and as having all power in His divine nature, united with His glorified humanity, in heaven and on earth to defend, protect, govern and guide His people safely and victoriously on their way.

The eye of faith, therefore, can look through the gospel as a

medium of spiritual vision beyond what it sees of Jesus in His earthly life, to what it may now, with practiced power, see of Him in heaven. This looking and seeing is not imagining, dreaming, speculating; it brings to view no mere phantom, or fancy, on which, as a creation of the mind's own activity, the excited thoughts or feelings may rapturously gaze. What is looked unto, and seen, is the true, real Jesus. And if the gaze, the "looking," is an act of true faith, regulated and informed by the teaching of the Spirit through the Word, Jesus is what faith sees Him to be. He that in Matthew and Luke was seen as the babe in the manger, is beheld as now exalted far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named." He that in all the gospels is seen to be poor, not having where to lay His head, is contemplated as now being the King of kings, and Lord of lords, the dispenser of the richest gifts of earth, and the more excellent blessings of heaven, holding all things in His hands. And thus seen, the vision not only inspires devout adoration, but joyful courage and hope. What He achieved, He will enable His faithful followers to achieve. He achieved for them, and they shall share the benefits. To a Jesus so triumphant and mighty, so glorious and gracious, they can look in full assurance of faith that He will never leave them, and never forsake them. When their faith may seem to falter, they look to Him and have their faltering faith confirmed. When their hope droops, they look unto Him, and their drooping hope revives. Whatever their trials or their straits, looking unto Him is sure to bring full and speedy relief.

This is to be done *continuously*. It is to be the constant habit of the believer. His pilgrimage, warfare and work, must and can, properly, have no interruption; and hence he needs to be *ever* looking unto Jesus for strength and grace. With this general habit, however, he will find his wants as well as his feelings prompting him to special *prayer* and *supplication*, as acts of more intense and earnest looking to the source of all spiritual help and comfort.

#### *Why*

This should be done, is a question which has been virtually answered in what has already been said upon the subject. But the reasons may be briefly gathered and summed up into these:

1. Because in Jesus alone, as now exalted to heavenly glory,



can be perfectly seen what the Christian needs to see in the way of an inspiring pattern and cheering consolation.

2. Because He is presented in the Scriptures as prëeminently the object for such contemplation for all believers.

3. Because from Him alone, and from Him directly, can the strength and comfort longed for and required, be obtained.

4. Because He is always at hand, and most abundantly able and willing to succor those who look unto Him for aid.

5. Because He best knows how and when to help.

6. And finally, because the cloud of witnesses compassing us about, all with one accord, point our faith to Him, as the only true *Jesus* in heaven or on earth. Such is the testimony of saints, redeemed, around His throne. Such is the testimony of the angels; even of those which most excel in strength, as their prostrate forms all point, not to any of superior rank in their own number, not to any patriarch or prophet, pope, priest, or saint ransomed from earth, *but* to Him whom all unite in lauding as alone worthy to receive glory, and honor and power, even the Lamb that was slain, but now siteth upon the throne, for ever and ever. Amen, and Amen.

---

THE HELP OF THE LORD.

---

FROM THE FRENCH OF JOHN FREDERIC OBERLIN.

---

"BE careful for nothing."—PHIL. 4: 6.

"De quoi t'alarmes-tu, mon cœur?"

WHY art thou cast down, O my soul?

Uplift thee, and be strong;

Thy care upon thy Maker roll,

Thy sadness doth him wrong.

Beneath his eye

Thy goings lie,

Thy God who rules above,

His child doth know and love.

Come, gaze on yonder vaulted sky;

Say, can thy glance embrace

The worlds wherewith the Lord most high  
Hath sown the fields of space ;  
Though skill of thine  
And strength combine,  
Yet never shall thy hand  
Create one grain of sand.

Thy Helper is the Lord of all,  
He marks thy lightest sigh:  
A thousand means at His high call,  
For thy defence are nigh.  
Safe in his care,  
No storm shall bear  
One hair from off thy head,  
Though nature quails in dread.

Thou formed'st man of earthly mould,  
Almighty ! by thy power:  
Not Solomon, in gems and gold,  
Could match thy simplest flower:  
Thy single Word  
Sufficed, O Lord,  
To fill heaven's boundless sphere,  
And lo ! I faint and fear !

The worlds which run their course on high,  
This blossom sweet and fair,  
The stars in voiceless harmony,  
Yon leaflet falling there—  
Shall these obey  
One law, one sway,  
And I aside be thrown,  
The sport of chance alone ?

Then with thy cares, my soul, have done:  
Thy grief beclouds thy view:  
How shall not He who gave His Son,  
Give food and raiment too ?  
The life is more  
Than roof and store:  
No fear lest thou His child  
Be from His care exiled !

Long as I live, my hand in thine,  
I to thy side will cling,  
For life is gain, O Guide divine !  
While safe beneath thy wing.  
Lo ! all is well !

Each ill shall tell  
For blessing, moulded still  
By thy controlling will.

If thou give ear when I aspire,  
I'll praise thy tenderness;  
And if thou cross my hearts' desire,  
I will thy wisdom bless:  
All-gracious One,  
Thy will be done!  
Thy love I know, I see;  
And I can trust in thee!

And when thy solemn call I hear,  
And yield my latest sigh,  
Then, O my Father, draw thou near,  
And give me grace to die!  
So while at rest  
Upon thy breast  
My spirit thou shalt keep,  
My dust in hope shall sleep.

—*Sunday Magazine.*

---

THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

CHAPTER XV.

*Of the True Justification of Believers.*

To justify, signifies according to the apostle Paul, *to remit sins, to declare free from guilt and punishment, to receive into grace and declare just*; Rom. 8: 33; 34. Justification and condemnation are opposites; Acts. 13: 38, 39; Deut. 25: 1; Isa. 5: 23.

But it cannot be denied, that by nature we are all sinners and godless, and that before the judgment seat of God we are guilty of transgression and worthy of death; but we are justified, that is, that we become acquitted from sin and death through God the judge, through the grace of Christ alone and without any merit of ours. For what is plainer than what Paul says (Rom. 3: 23, 24), "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."



For Christ took upon Himself and bore the sins of the world, and did satisfy the divine justice. But God is merciful in respect to our sins, for Christ alone, who died and rose again, and does not reckon them with us, but reckons the righteousness of Christ into us, as our own. So that we are now not only washed and purified from sin, or holy, but also endued with the righteousness of Christ, and acquitted from sin and death, or condemnation, yea, righteous and heirs of eternal life; 2 Cor. 5: 19, 21. In short, God alone makes us righteous, and only for the sake of Christ, in that He reckons to us, not sin, but *His own righteousness*; Rom. 4: 23, 25.

But because this justification is received, not by any works, but through faith in God's mercy and in Christ, therefore we teach and believe with the apostle, that sinful man becomes righteous alone through faith in Christ, and not through the law or any works. For the apostle says (Rom. 3: 28), "Therefore, we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what saith the Scriptures? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness;" Rom. 4: 2, 6. Gen. 15: 6. Also Eph. 2: 8, 9. Therefore, because faith lays hold of Christ as our righteousness, and attributes all to the grace of God in Christ, righteousness is attributed to faith for Christ's sake, and not on this account, because it is our work. It is the gift of God.

That we do receive Christ through faith (become partakers of Him), the Lord affirms many times. See John 6: 27, 47, 48, 58, where he putteth *eating* for believing, and believing for eating. For, as by eating we become partakers of food, so by believing we become partakers of Christ.

Therefore, we by no means divide the benefit of justification, giving part to the grace of God and part to ourselves, our works of love or merit; but we ascribe it wholly and alone to the grace of God in Christ, and that through faith. For our charity and our works could not be pleasing to God, as coming from unjust ones; hence we must first become righteous before we can love or do just works. As we have said, we become truly righteous through faith in Christ,

out of the pure grace of God, who reckons to us, not sin, but the righteousness of Christ, and so also reckons faith in Him as our righteousness.

Moreover, the apostle plainly deduces love from faith, when he says (1 Tim. 1 : 5), "Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of pure heart, and of a good conscience *and of faith unfeigned.*" Hence, we do not here speak of a feigned (imaginary) faith, of an empty, idle or dead faith, but of a living and life-giving faith, which is living through Christ (who is life and gives life to every one whom he apprehends), and which proves itself to be living, by living works.

James does not contradict our doctrine, for he speaks of a vain and dead faith, on account of which some were puffed up, but who had not Christ living in them by faith. He says (James 2 : 14, 26), that we become righteous through works, not contradicting Paul, but showing that Abraham by his works proved his living and justifying faith. And so do all pious persons, who yet trust in Christ alone and not in their works. The Apostle speaks further in Gal. 2 : 20, 21.

CHAPTER XVI.

*Of Faith; of good Works; of their Reward; and of man's Merit.*

Christian faith is not an opinion, or a human persuasion ; but the most sure trust, a clear and steadfast agreement of the heart; and then also the surest laying hold of the truth of God set forth in the Holy Scriptures and the apostolic confession of faith ; consequently, laying hold of God himself, the highest good, and especially of the divine promises, and of Christ who is the consummation of all promises.

But this faith is *purely* a gift of God, which He of grace bestows upon His elect, whenever and in what measure he wills, and this through the Holy Spirit, by means of the preaching of the gospel and believing prayer. This faith also has its growth, which again is the gift of God ; else the Apostles would not have said, "Lord, increase our faith." Luke 17 : 5.

All that we have thus far said concerning faith, this the apostles taught before us. Paul says (Heb. 11 : 1) "Faith is the substance the (υποστασις or sure ground) of things hoped for, and the evidence (ελεγχος or clear and certain contents) of things not seen." And again (2 Cor. 1 : 20), "All the promises of God," &c. Phil.

1: 29. Further, he says to the Philippians (1: 29), that "it was given them to believe in Christ." So also Rom. 12: 3, "God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." And again (2 Thess. 3: 2), "all men have not faith," and that all do not believe the gospel (2 Thess. 1: 8). Luke also says (Acts 13: 48), that as many as were ordained unto eternal life, believed. Hence Paul (Titus 1: 1), calls faith the faith of God's elect." And again (Rom. 10: 17), "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." In other places he also often commands us to pray for faith.

The same Apostle calls faith (Gal. 5: 6), "faith which worketh by love." This faith gives the conscience peace, and opens a free access to God, so that we can come to him with confidence, and obtain from him that which is profitable and necessary.

Faith keeps us in our duty, which we owe to God and our neighbor; in adversity it strengthens our patience; it forms and expresses the confession of the truth. In short, it brings forth all sorts of good fruits and works; Gal. 5: 6. Rom. 5: 1, 2.

We teach that truly good works grow out of a living faith, or are born of the Holy Spirit, and are done by believers according to the will and the rule of the word of God. Peter says (2 Pet. 1: 5), "giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue, &c."

We have already said that the law of God, which contains the will of God, presents us patterns of good works, 1 Thess. 4: 3, 6. For, before God, those works and worship avail not which are taken up according to our own liking, which Paul calls "will-worship" (Col. 2: 23), of which the Lord also speaks in Matt. 15: 9.

Hence we reject such works, and approve and appraise and emphasize such which are according to the will and commandment of God. They must be done, not that we may try their merit to eternal life (for eternal life is the gift of God, Rom. 6: 23); nor to be seen of men, (which the Lord condemns), nor for the sake of advantage, but for the honor of God, to adorn our calling, to manifest thankfulness to God, and to benefit our neighbor. Matt. 6: 2, 23, 14. Matt. 5: 16. So also Paul, in Col. 1: 10. 3: 17. "Walk worthy of your calling, &c." Eph. 4: 1. Phil. 2: 4. Titus. 3: 14.

Although, therefore, we teach with the Apostle (Eph. 2: 8. Rom. 3: 28), that a man is justified by faith in Christ, and not through any good works, yet we do not on that account reject or



place a slight value on good works. We know that a man is not created nor regenerated through faith, that he should be idle, but rather that he should unceasingly do those things which are good and profitable, Matt. 7: 17. John 15: 5. Eph. 2: 10. Titus 2: 14.

We therefore condemn all who despise good works, or prate that they are unnecessary and not to be regarded. But, as we said before, we do not think that we are saved by good works, nor that they are so necessary to salvation that no man can be saved without them; for we are saved through the grace and benefit of Christ alone. Works are necessarily produced by faith; salvation is improperly ascribed to works; for in the most proper sense, it must be ascribed to grace. Well known is that saying of the Apostle (Rom. 11: 6), "If by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work."

The works which we do from faith are pleasing to God, and are approved of Him; because those persons are pleasing to God, on account of faith in Christ, who do good works; the works themselves also are done through the Holy Spirit by the grace of God, Acts 10: 34, 35. Col. 1: 9, 10.

Hence, we diligently teach, not false or philosophical virtues, but truly good works and properly Christian duties, and impress them upon all with the greatest possible zeal and earnestness, reproving the slothfulness and hypocrisy of all those who with the mouth praise and confess the gospel, but with their shameful lives dishonor the same; we hold up before them God's terrible threatenings, but also His large promises and the rich reward, exhorting, comforting and rebuking them. For, we also teach, that God calls to those who do well, (Jer. 31: 16), "Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for thy work shall be rewarded." In the gospel also the Lord said (Matt. 5: 12), "Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." Matt. 10: 42.

But this reward which the Lord gives we do not ascribe to the merit of man, who receives; but to the goodness or liberality, and the truth of God who promises or gives it; who, although He owes nothing to any, yet has promised to give the reward to those who faithfully worship Him; and does give it, that they may praise Him.

For the rest, in the works of the (so-called) saints, there is much

unworthy of God, and much that is imperfect. But because God in grace accepts these works for Christ's sake, therefore He gives them the promised reward. For, otherwise our righteousness is compared to filthy rags, Isa. 64: 6. Luke 17: 10.

Although we hence teach that God rewards our good works, yet we teach also with Augustine, that God does crown in us, not our merits, but His gifts. And, as a consequence, we say of all rewards which we receive, that it is grace, and rather grace than a reward, because whatsoever good things we do, we do rather through God than through ourselves, 1 Cor. 4: 7. From this passage the blessed martyr Cyprian deduces, "We must not boast of anything, since nothing is our own."

Hence we reject all who place such a value upon the merits of man as to make the grace of God superfluous.

J. H. G.

---

#### LOWER STONE CHURCH.

(THE following article was written several years since, but for want of a periodical in which to publish, it was laid aside. It may have some interest for those who sympathize with our Southern church, and is placed at the disposal of the editor of the *Reformed Church Monthly*.)

The King's business recently required the writer to visit the Reformed churches in Rowan county, North Carolina. It was a calm and beautiful evening, late in the summer, when the train of the N. C. R. R. bore us unto the ancient and honorable town of Salisbury, the shiretown of Rowan county. We lingered a few moments to look at the new and convenient passenger depot in process of completion, (burnt near the close of the rebellion by the U. S. troops). The descending sun admonishing us to be in haste, we took our seat in a buggy by the side of our friend, the Pastor of the East Rowan charge (Rev. T. Butler, dec'd). The ride of 12 miles was beguiled in talking over the interest of the King in that region, and long ere we reached *the Parsonage* the stars shed their faint light on our wooded pathway. The Parsonage of the Eastern Rowan charge is hard by "the Lower Stone Church," as it is termed in common, or "Die Gnaden Kirche" in ecclesiastical lan-

guage. Of the origin and history of this Reformed church we made a few notes; and as they may in the future be of some service to the historian of our Reformed churches, we will copy them. Our authority for the facts and traditions we give, is statements made by Rev. Mr. Butler and elder George Barnhardt.

This region, of which the "Organ church" and "Lower Stone church" are the centres, was settled probably about 1750, by emigrants from Pennsylvania, of German extraction, and members both of the Reformed and Lutheran churches. The descendants of many of these early settlers may still be found on or near the old homesteads, viz: Lingles, Bergers, Fishers, Lippards, Peelers, Holzhausers, Barnhardts, Klutts, Roseman, Yost, Foil, Boger, Shupping, etc. As was common in those early days, the first house of worship provided in this new German settlement, was a union church, of Lutheran and Reformed, and called "Fulenwider's" or St. Peters church, situated about six miles N. E. of the present Lower Stone church. From some cause, distance or want of harmony, it was deemed best by the Reformed members to build a new church at a more convenient point. It was the wish of the Reformed party again to unite and erect a union church, but the Lutherans being quite numerous and wealthy, proceeded to build what is now known as "the Organ church" for their own exclusive use. This had an effect not designed; it roused the spirit of self-reliance, and determined the Reformed to have also a house of their own, in which to worship the God of their fathers after the pattern received from them. For this purpose they selected a parcel of ground on a slight eminence on the great highway that leads from Gold Hill to Beatty's Ford, four miles west of the former place. The situation is not well chosen. Both east and west the horizon is bounded by higher hills, and it is only distant from the "Organ church" two miles. A purchase was made here of 16 acres of land from Lorentz Lingle, for two pounds proclamation money of the *Province of North Carolina*. This was part of a large tract of land granted to said Lingle by the Earl of Granville, one of the Proprietors of the Province. The deed bears date 1774, and conveys the land to Andrew Holtzhauser and John Lippard, for the use of "the Calvin congregation." (The Reformed were, in this *Province*, in their early days distinguished from all others as the followers of the great Genevese Reformer). The original building was of logs, but was retained only for a short time. There



seems to have been some defect in the first title, for the original trustees conveyed the land to Jacob Fisher and John Casper, and in this deed the church is named "The German Presbyterian Congregation on Second Creek in the Dutch settlement." The records show that already in 1782 Samuel Suther, who had removed thither from Guilford county, was the Pastor. In the meantime the Lutherans, two miles west on the same public highway, had rebuilt "the Organ church" of stone. This would make it exceptionally fine for those days, and proof of wealth and taste. As the spirit of denominational rivalry had already been awakened by the separation at St. Peter's, this move formed by the Lutherans only served to increase and fan it to a flame. The Reformed awaited its completion, and then determined also to build a stone church; and as it stands on lower ground and is nearer the sea-coast, it received, in distinction from the Organ or Upper Stone church, the common name of the Lower Stone church, until this day. It was not only determined to build a stone church, but it was further planned that when built, it must be so long, so wide, and so high, that it could contain the entire Lutheran church; and this was accordingly done after a time. This spirit may not be such as can be commended, but for the men of those days to resolve, was to do, and they set about their work in 1795.

G. W. W.

---

"While he was yet a great way off his Father saw him." Luke xv. 20. What wondrous love and compassion! God's watchful eye notices the first yearnings of the soul towards him; the first sigh of the returning prodigal, "A great way off," yet *upon the way*. In this lies the difference between the penitent and the unbeliever. The first step has been taken. Let a wanderer but turn from his evil way and he will find God's hand outstretched to help, his grace ready to strengthen and guide.

"A great way off?" How far, Omniscience only knows. We can but faintly estimate the distance between a holy God and our sin-polluted souls; every transgression increasing the distance and rendering the return more and more difficult and uncertain. How shall we ever fathom the depth of that love which, while so abhorring sin, still yearns over us. Our Saviour stands with open arms ready to embrace and forgive—only return, repent, believe.

THE GENERAL SYNOD AT CINCINNATI.

ALTHOUGH the two items of business reported in our previous articles on the late General Synod possessed special interest, on account of the broad and fundamental principles they involved, and the far-reaching effects of the Synod's disposal of them, it would be a great mistake to suppose that nothing else of importance was done at Cincinnati. If other matters acted upon seem of less practical as well as theoretical significance, it must be only in consequence of the more absorbing concern felt in regard to the appeal of Prof. Super and the complaint of Elder Dunn, and the more serious issues which were believed to hang upon the General Synod's action with reference to them.

Apart, however, from what was done in those cases, the ruling earnest spirit, and the genuinely Reformed character of the Synod, were plainly and cheerily indicated by what was done relatively to several other points affecting the inner life and future operations of the church.

Among these we notice, as justly entitled to prominent consideration, the measures adopted in furtherance of

*The Union Movement.*

It has long been felt by many ministers and members of the two branches of the *Reformed church* in this country, which bear in common the title *Reformed* (Reformed German, and Reformed Dutch), that the two should be united or consolidated into one. No serious or insuperable obstacles are believed to lie in the way of such a union. Many strong reasons are believed to exist in favor of it. It is not denied that time and care might be required to adjust matters so that the union might work smoothly, pleasantly and to the advancement of the common cause. But any difficulties which some may see in the path towards the proposed coalescence, are considered to be more imaginary and formal than real. Considerations like the following, have been urged very effectively in favor of the proposed consolidation.

1. The very intimate relation in which the two churches *originally* stood to each other in Europe, making them virtually one in their faith, organization, close ecclesiastical fellowship, worship, and reigning spirit.

2. Their subsequent cordial coöperation with each other, in Christian acts of mutual aid, and in efforts to extend the Redeemer's kingdom. This, as has been truly stated, showed itself in the kind, fostering care extended by the church of Holland (the Reformed Dutch church), to our branch of the Reformed church, during the period of its early settlement in America.

3. The fact that both *churches* as such, hold the same doctrinal standards, the Heidelberg Catechism, and other kindred Confessions; that they have always clung zealously to these standards, and maintained their evangelical doctrines, under all circumstances, whatever might be the unfavorable influences and tendencies of some periods in their history.

4. That the separation of the two churches is unnatural, unnecessary, and prejudicial to the interests of both, and not to be justified upon gospel grounds.

5. That by uniting the strength, means and activities of the two, one Reformed church in this country would be constituted, which would be far more efficient for good, than both now are or can be.

This may be taken as a summary of the leading arguments and motives which have been advanced in favor of the proposed union. No one will question their force or deny their claim to earnest consideration. And though we have regretted to see some uncharitable and hardly ingenuous attempts made to prejudice the movement, by exciting improper feelings against it, no refutation of the reasons by which it has been advocated has thus far appeared.

It is to be particularly noted, that the movement proposes a *union* of the two churches, not a *merging* of the one into the other, or an absorption of one by the other. There is to be no "selling to the Dutch," or Deutsch, on either side, as was ungenerously charged some time back in Dr. Fisher's *Messenger*. Any arrangement made, should the plan succeed, is to be made upon conditions entirely equitable to both churches, and calculated to promote a cordial union of the two branches. Such at least has been our understanding of the matter, so far as we have been able to give the subject thought; though this, under the pressure of other duties, has been to but a limited degree.

The subject had been brought to the attention of the General Synods of Dayton, 1866, and Philadelphia, 1869; but through the influence of the leaders of the Mercersburg theology party, was



coldly received and summarily dismissed by a majority of those voting. At Dayton, an appropriate report, prepared by Dr. Willard, was strongly opposed, then *amended* by a *substitute* which cut down the paper, covering a page in the printed minutes, to a cavalier-like *negative* resolution of *three lines*, to which *another amendment*, favoring immediate measures looking to the proposed union, was added, calling out renewed opposition; when finally, those adverse to the movement, resorted to their usual tactics of defeating by *postponement* what they find themselves unable to thwart by fairer means—and so carried a motion to postpone the whole subject to the next General Synod.

This, of course, brought up the matter at the General Synod of Philadelphia, (1869), where again the High-church party, contrary to their own expectations, happened to have a majority. But their vision of the union movement seems not to have improved. For, after some very pleasant sentences about the close consanguinity between the two bodies, and a reciprocation of the kind feelings displayed, &c., the report they presented and carried, concludes significantly by saying: "*But we do not see our way clear at this time to take any more definite action on this subject.*"

These two instances plainly betray the feeling of the Mercersburg-Lancaster leaders in regard to the proposed union. And it is altogether probable, that if the same party had found itself able to carry points at Cincinnati, the subject would have fared no better than it did at Philadelphia and Dayton.

The Cincinnati Synod, however, showed itself to be ruled in this, as in other matters disposed of, not by considerations for party interests as superior to the church, but by a regard for the true interests of the church, as above all partisan schemes and purposes. The majority there represented no party school, seeking to make the church and Synod a means for serving its projects. There was no such party for it to represent. Hence, the freedom of its action in matters of general concern.

The disposition made of the union question, furnishes a pleasant illustration of this fact. After a brief, calm discussion, the subject was referred to a special committee of twelve, Rev. Dr. Welker acting as chairman. After taking due time for deliberation, this committee presented the following report:

The committee to whom was referred the several documents relating to a closer union with the Reformed (Dutch) church in

America, together with the formal request of the delegates from the General Synod of that body, asking for an expression of the views of this Synod on this subject, report that this report having been before the mind of the church for several years, and thoroughly discussed in all its bearings, and the conclusions reached have found utterance in the actions of several church courts. The General Assembly at Philadelphia, in 1869, had already said that a close union between the two bodies so intimately related in doctrine, cultus and name, would be both natural and desirable so soon as the consummation could be reached with the cordial consent of both parties. It is believed that the action of our church courts is not only in harmony with the common feeling of Protestant Christendom regarding the necessity for unity in the body of Christ, but it is further held that it is expressive of the sincere desire of the church which the General Synod represents; that it would be a matter for rejoicing throughout its congregation to be brought into the closest relations for which the providence of the great Head of the church may prepare the way. The union of these two members of the Reformed church would realize the accomplishment of a hope long cherished. Under this view your committee propose the following as the action of this General Synod:

*“Resolved,* That this General Synod is in full accord with the prevailing sentiment in the church, as it regards the desirableness of Christian unity, and looks forward with pleasure to a union with the Reformed church in America that may be accomplished on a basis satisfactory to both churches. Believing that the time to be at hand when negotiations looking to this end should be initiated, it is resolved by the General Synod, to appoint a committee of three from each of the five Synods comprising the General Synod, who shall confer with a like committee of the Reformed church of America, on the proposed union between that church and our own, and report the results of their conference to the General Synod at the next meeting.” [Signed) G. W. Welker, David Winters, J. O. Miller, G. B. Russell, G. Fuendeling, G. Z. Mechling, J. Bossard, P. Greding, G. Wiest, J. Greenameier, Wm. Miller.

This report was adopted, and the following resolution was also adopted and appended thereto:

*Resolved,* That all the Synods represented in this General

Synod, at the ensuing annual meetings, appoint the committees named in the report of the committee on the question of union with the Reformed Church in America.

This brings the matter formally and fairly before both the churches concerned, and in a manner due to so vitally interesting a subject. It shows that our church is disposed to give it the earnest attention it merits, and will doubtless elicit corresponding action from the sister church. Many things will of course have to be judiciously considered before a decisive step is taken; and possibly the deliberations may not result in immediate union. But the subject has at least gained a favorable position, and will doubtless work out a satisfactory solution of the important problem it involves.

Another happy illustration of the spirit which ruled the late General Synod, is furnished by its action upon the work of

*Foreign Missions.*

For several years (five or six at least) the church has been afforded no immediate opportunity of taking an active part in the great work of spreading the gospel in heathen lands. The only link which bound us to the golden chain of interest and coöperation in one of the most noble Christian enterprises of the age, was dropped or broken. How this came to be done, and why it was done, is left for those to explain who are most responsible in the case. The fact itself has been painfully felt by many. It could not be otherwise with those in whose hearts glowed the love of Him who, as He himself had come forth from the Father to redeem a lost world, laid it as a perpetually binding law upon the church, that it should ever be a missionary commission, going forth into all the world and preaching the Gospel to every creature. Although our branch of the Reformed church never took a very prominent or liberal part in this work, there was still something like a warm response to the appeals which *used to be* made for *Broosa* and *Aintab*, and some thrills of pure Christian joy gladdened not a few hearts when reports were published of the successful efforts of our once esteemed missionary, the Rev. Dr. B. Schneider, and his devoted wife. Some may remember the happy effect produced by the statement, that there was a peculiar fitness in the choice of Asia Minor as the field of our foreign missionary operations. *That*, it was said, was the scene of the Apostle John's missionary



labors; and *from* it the Gospel reached our distant German ancestors in the early centuries of the church. Now, therefore, the opportunity of repaying that old debt of charity, should be promptly seized!

Those appeals have died away, and so have the brethren of blessed memory who made them. For all the most of the present generation know or care about Aintab and Broosa, both might possibly have sunk into another Dead Sea. Whatever else our church has been during the last ten years—that is, since the Lancaster-Mercersburg ritualistic party has been making special efforts to gain ecclesiastical ascendancy for its innovations in theology and worship—it has not been a foreign missionary church. And it may be a fair and proper question to raise and to consider, however unpleasant, whether so far as that same influence has reached, it would have been a home missionary church, to the extent to which it has engaged in the work, except in the interests of a partisan theological propagandism.

Under these circumstances, it is pleasantly significant that a revival of interest in the foreign missions should be one of the marked features of the General Synod of Cincinnati. This fact may be traced partly, at least, to the influence of those *German* brethren whom Dr. Fisher called “foreign,” and whom Dr. Apple reproached as false and ungrateful.

The spirit of Evangelical Christianity and zeal for its advancement, seems to be more potent in the breasts of our German brethren than love for Mercersburg-Lancaster high-churchism. Accordingly, when our Synod was virtually sundered from all formal efforts to evangelize heathen countries, those brethren promptly united with others in organizing an independent movement. This movement is now in successful operation, having a flourishing mission in India, under the supervision of Rev. O. Lohr, a former missionary to the same country, but for some years afterwards pastor of the Reformed churches at Rahway, &c., New Jersey.

There were others, also, in the church, including doubtless not a few who may be somewhat in sympathy with Nevinism, whilst not endorsing its more radical peculiarities, who felt dissatisfied with past indifference to the claims of heathen nations. It seemed wrong to them, and inexcusable, that our membership should have no proper channel for the desire to obey their Master’s last great command.

This suppressed interest and conviction at length found utterance in the Cincinnati Synod. Under the report of the Committee on Missions, sentiments were expressed in favor of reëntering earnestly into the work, which had found no place at the two previous Synods, (excepting in some general recommendation of the society organized by the German brethren), and action was taken of a definite character likely to lead to desirable results.

Assuming, as we justly may, that this action was prompted by a proper spirit, it involves most cheering prospects. Hitherto, the zeal of the church, or its Synods rather, may have been too selfish. The mainspring of our efforts may have been too narrow-heartedly denominational. We sought rather to save *our* life. What has followed? Why should not the principle laid down by our Lord regarding such selfishness, apply to churches as well as to individuals? To shrink from "casting our bread on the waters," or from "sowing beside *all* streams," from fear of *wasting* our wealth and toils, shows a disregard for the broad principle of Christian charity in general beneficence, which is sure to end disadvantageously to those indulging such a fear. There is a "scattering" which yields the surest harvest. There is a "withholding" which tends to want.

The following resolution sets forth the result of the Synod's deliberations on the subject:

*Resolved*, That we instruct the Board of Missions to open a correspondence with the Foreign Mission Board of the Reformed Church in America, looking toward the sending of a missionary from our own church to India or China, to labor in the neighborhood in general sympathy with their missionaries already in the field.

Regarding the action of the Synod on this subject, therefore, of a virtual pledge to be governed more fully by the Gospel law—"He that loseth his life for My sake and the Gospel's, shall save it"—there is special reason for rejoicing in what was done, and for commending the Synod's revival of the work of foreign Missions in the church.

The cause of *Home Missions* received due attention. As our space will not allow the insertion of the report of the General Board at this time, it is reserved for future publication.

*Change of the Basis of Representation.*

Hitherto, each Classis sent the same number of delegates to the General Synod as to the District Synods. This not only involved

a heavy expense, but made the general body unnecessarily large, and onerous to entertain. To remedy these objections, a change of the basis of representation was adopted, by which the number of delegates will be reduced about one-half. The new basis is as follows :

A Classis, consisting of less than ten ministers, will send one minister and one elder ; with less than twenty ministers, it may send two ministers and two elders ; and so in proportion with a higher number.

The bearings of this charge upon future General Synods is important, and the new arrangement should be carefully considered in its legitimate workings.

Provisions were also made at Cincinnati for the formation of

*New District Synods.*

As steps had been previously taken for constituting a new Synod, to be composed of the Classes of Zion, Maryland, Mercersburg, Virginia, and North Carolina, nothing further was necessary than the General Synod's ratification of what had been done, and to provide for the formal organization of the new Synod. A place (Frederick, Md.,) was accordingly designated for the meeting of duly appointed delegates, and a committee was named, with the Rev. Dr. Zacharias, as Chairman, to fix the time for holding the meeting.

By the organization of this Synod, the geographical limits of the old Eastern Synod will be greatly reduced. Hereafter its territory will be bounded on the west by the Susquehanna, south of the Juniata junction, and on the south by the Maryland line. This reduction of its territory may well seem to require some corresponding change in its title. For it would be very incongruous to continue to call a Synod confined mainly to the Eastern third of Pennsylvania, the Synod of the United States of America.

*German Synods.*

A proper regard for the very natural desire of the more exclusively German pastors and congregations of the church, led in like manner to action, looking to and authorizing the formation of a new German Classis, with a view to their ultimate consolidation into Synods. To avoid difficulties and facilitate this movement, some action previously taken was more clearly defined by resolu-



tions, declaring that the Classes constituting such Synods, must merely lie adjacent to each other as *German* Classes, and that so soon as four such Classes unite in the matter, they may be at once constituted a Synod, without awaiting for the ratification of the General Synod.

As there is no wish on the part of the German brethren to break up the unity of the church by the formation of such District Synods on the basis of language, so it is to be hoped that the movement will have no tendency to such a result. There is no reason why it should. True church unity does not depend upon external, formal union, in organization. Two Classes or Synods of ministers and people, holding sincerely and honestly the same faith and principles, may get along more harmoniously on the same territory than one Classis or Synod into which elements of discord have been brought by departures from the established faith and principles, and introduction of strange and antagonistic doctrines and practices. We have no apprehensions in view of the arrangements proposed, but believe that it may prove a means of safety for the church not now thought of. There may be some danger of occasional collisions or conflicts, on account of supposed or real Synodical interests. But all such, should they occur, would no doubt be easily adjusted. On the other hand, the advantages of the new arrangement are manifest, and rightly improved can hardly fail to serve the best interests of Christianity and the church.

*Proposed Changes in the Constitution.*

As the work of the Special Committee to revise the Constitution has been progressing too slowly for the purposes and wishes of some persons, several modifications of the present Constitution were proposed at Cincinnati, and urged for immediate adoption. The proposed changes were seriously important, and really affected vital principles. The most significant, recommended the institution of a "*Court of Appeals*," to which all cases of appeal from the action of a lower Synod, should be referred for *final and unconditional adjudication or settlement*. The Synod very wisely declined to take any further action on the proposition, than to refer it to the Special Committee on the Constitution. As we may give some attention to this subject in a future number of the *Monthly*, it is dismissed now with the single remark, that however

much leading high-churchmen in the Eastern Synod may have felt themselves restrained and annoyed by the right of appeal from their measures to the General Synod, that right, under existing circumstances, is too precious a safeguard against injurious legislation by the lower courts, to be curtailed or in any way modified at this time.

#### *The Time of Meeting*

For the General Synod, has been happily changed from late autumn to *spring*. Accordingly, the next General Synod will convene in Fort Wayne, Indiana, on May 19th, 1875.

This had been determined at one of the earlier sessions of the Synod. But the Lancaster-Mercersburg delegates were not satisfied with the *place* selected. It seemed unfavorable to their interests. Hence, late on Thursday evening, after some delegates had left, and just as Synod was approaching its adjournment, a reconsideration of the previous action was moved, in order to secure the choice of *Lancaster, Pa.*, as the place of the next meeting. The attempt seemed so evidently disingenuous at that late hour, that it naturally caused some excitement. Under the excitement, the President, whose entire course must have commended his official acts as most unexceptionably impartial and equitable throughout, committed, possibly, a formal error in pronouncing the *motion of reconsideration* out of order, on grounds of equity, instead of deciding that a two-thirds majority would be necessary to carry it. But as the motion to sustain the President was carried by a majority, the effect of his decision did not impair the chance of those who favored the change. So the choice of Fort Wayne was reaffirmed, and the anti-Lancaster-Mercersburg character of the Synod was maintained to the end. The effort made in this case, however, shows how important it is for delegates to remain at their posts until the body has really adjourned. It is possible that if this attempt at reconsidering and annulling previous action had succeeded, others might have been made with a similar result. "Be ye wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."

Of other items attended to, we name only the following as possessing special interest:

#### *Orphans' Homes.*

The reports rendered of those in operation, exhibited this part of

the beneficent work of the church in a promising light. The following paper prepared by the Special Committee on the subject, was adopted :

The Committee on Orphans' Homes respectfully submit the following report :

But one document has been placed in our hands—the report of the President and Superintendent of the Orphans' Home at Womelsdorf. The debt resting upon that institution three years ago, has been canceled, and its condition, as set forth in the report, is such as to call for devout gratitude to God, who has put it into the hearts of His people to devise liberal things, and to provide for the feeding, clothing and religious training of the lambs of Christ. The work accomplished by this Home and the one at Butler, Pa., is one that commends itself to the church, and calls for continued prosecution on a more extended and liberal scale. We recommend the adoption of the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That the cause of the orphans be commended to the cordial sympathy and support of all our pastors, Sunday-schools and members, and that they be requested to continue, and, if possible, increase their contributions to the Homes at Womelsdorf and Butler, Pa.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN S. FOULK, Chairman.

*Regarding Divorce.*

In compliance with some requests made for a deliverance of the Synod on this subject, the Synod after due consideration adopted the following paper, which, it will be observed, does not commit the church to any extreme view in the case. After dwelling upon the importance of the subject, the paper proceeds :

That there are difficulties in the way of giving a clear utterance on the subject of divorce, to cover all cases, is confessed by all. And yet no one will question that the only plea which should govern the Christian, is the law laid down by Christ and his apostles in the New Testament Scriptures ; therefore,

*Resolved*, That in the absence of any specific case of divorce before us, the General Synod affirm, that it is its opinion that the judicatories of this church be governed by the New Testament Scriptures in determining the grounds of divorce, as of paramount authority.

Respectfully submitted,

J. O. MILLER, Chairman.

*The Closing Services*

Of the Synod were most appropriate and impressive by their simplicity and fervor. They consisted of a few words of thanks by the President, the united avowal of our common faith in the articles of the Apostles' Creed, singing and prayer. As in all the



previous devotions of this Synod, so in these concluding acts of worship, the services were in pleasant and edifying harmony with the usage of the Reformed church. In this respect, those services were in happy contrast with the offensive new-order innovations obtruded upon other Synods, and with which the more zealous disciples of that school, in Eastern Synods, mar its seasons of worship.

*Reflections and Results.*

1. The review now taken of the late General Synod proves it to have been at least equal in importance to either of the two preceding General Synods. Attempts have been made by Dr. Apple to belittle it. Such attempts spring so manifestly from chagrined partisanship, and so palpably misrepresent the bearing and significance of the deliberations and acts of the Synod, that they deserve no refutation. It is easy to understand why the doings of the Synod were not to his mind, and the cause of his dissatisfaction with it. But how one holding, avowedly, the ultra high-church notions of ecclesiastical councils peculiar to his party, and putting that party in close affinity with Popery, could indulge in discourteous and disparaging criticisms upon the character and acts of the Synod at Cincinnati, cannot be pleasantly explained.

From first to last the proceedings of the Synod were prevailingly marked by decorum and courteous propriety. This was its ruling spirit. The majority, consciously strong, took not the slightest advantage of its strength, but showed throughout fraternal deference to the minority. No previous Synod was ever presided over with more generous impartiality. In distributing the work of the Synod among the several Committees called for, the minority cannot complain that it was slighted; there seems rather to have been a special effort to avoid even the appearance of such a slighting. *Dr. Gerhart*, the President of the General Synod of Philadelphia, was made Chairman of the Committee on the State of the Church, the most honorable (if there be any distinction) which could have been assigned to him.

The discussions of the Synod were fully as earnest, dignified and intelligent, and displayed as much ability as those of any former meeting. Excepting only Dr. J. W. Nevin, "the flower and strength" of the Lancaster-Mercersburg party were there to abet and defend their cause, and they did their best. But they found themselves met at every point by logic every what is keen, arguments

more vigorous, and rhetoric more effective than any they could command. Nothing was carried by vituperation, calumnious charges, personal assaults, overbearing denunciation, such as marred the Synod of Dayton, and to some extent that of Philadelphia. And as for partisan manœuvering, if there was any, we were not privy to it, and it must have been confined to the tactics of the minority. The same spirit of generosity which characterized the appointment of committees, was displayed in the election of members for the several boards of the Synod, as may be seen by consulting the lists on another page. All this exhibits a pleasing contrast to some antecedents.

2. How important and significant were some of the principal acts of the Synod, must be evident not only from the great dissatisfaction of the minority with them, but from the interests and principles which are involved in them. It is true, there was no discussion of new-orderism and the perilous anti-Reformed doctrines it represents—at least none in form. But every delegate to the body knew, and, it might be almost said, the whole church knew, that the very substance and life of the new-order movement were implicated in what was discussed and done, in the two leading items which engaged the attention of the Synod. Especially did the leading representatives of that movement fully understand this.

This was particularly manifest in the *Super Appeal* and *Dunn* complaint cases. Throughout the discussion of those cases, the minority, (as they turned out to be), betrayed a painful conviction, that they regarded their cause as in peril of its very life. Hence, the threat ominously uttered, that if the decision went against them, the General Synod had not only better dissolve, but the church also divide on the basis of party affinity.

Vital issues were at stake, and were felt to be at stake. They did not, indeed, come up in the (abstract doctrine) form of theological debate, in which there might be room for any amount of sophistical confusion. But they presented themselves in the more practical and tangible form of facts, and matter-of-fact cases. Here there was less room for "pious frauds," and specious, ambiguous statements. Hence, the open fairness of the contest. Every one could see and know what the case in hand meant. Hence, also, the results, and "those tears" which have since overflowed the columns of the unhappy, disappointed *Messenger*.

3. And what are the results? This may be seen by considering briefly what the two cases named involved.

The former, *the Super Appeal*, was nothing less than a grappling of new-orderism in the East with the Reformed opposition to it, as represented by Ursinus College. As has been forcibly proven by Prof. Super in the January number of the *Monthly*, the Mercersburg-Lancaster party felt, that to carry its measures, that College, in its distinctive character and work, must be crushed. In the ardent language of one who feels strongly in the case, "*It must be laid out flat*;" (only, instead of *it*, the speaker used a *personal* pronoun.) So the action of the Synod of Martinsburg meant, when stripped of its foliage (fig-leaves): Our new-orderism must be put down and utterly disable all opposition to it. That opposition may have a mouth to cry out with, but it shall have no arms to work with. It must be made impotent. So we are persuaded Lancaster and Mercersburg, and the *Mittelmässig Messenger* understood it. It was a challenge of the opposition to mortal combat, or rather a summons to execution. It does not change the real interest of those who planned the measure, that they erred utterly in their calculations and assumptions in the case. Doubtless, they would have found themselves grievously mistaken even had their scheme succeeded. The evangelical life of the Reformed church, we rejoice with gratitude to feel assured, is not bound up wholly with a single institution, and would not perish with its destruction, even could it have been so destroyed, of which we had no serious fears. But the zealous movers of the measure in question, erroneously assumed the contrary, and rushed onward under this assumption.

Hence, the Appeal mentioned, involved every thing vital to the high-church party, its theology, ritualism, and all. So that party felt, and so the General Synod at Cincinnati understood the case. And it was with this full, clear understanding of it, that the Synod decided the Appeal in favor of the old Reformed cause in the East, and against the interests and earnest protests of the new-order party. The decision was a triumphant vindication of the ancient faith and principles of the Reformed church as Protestant and Evangelical, against ritualistic, ultra-Lutheran or semi-Popish innovations.

This might be made still more apparent by showing, if space allowed, what would necessarily and certainly have followed, by



the attempts at least of the Eastern high-church party, had the Appeal not been sustained. But, for the present, we must forbear from dwelling upon this supposable aspect of the case. Our readers need only refer to the Martinsburg action, and imagine the expected and designed effect of its being executed.

The Dunn complaint furnishes an illustration of the same thing in another form. The action which led to that complaint meant, and was really declared to mean, nothing less than to compel, by ecclesiastical means, even those who were strongly opposed in conscience to Mercersburgism, to support it with their money. And so it again was understood by the Synod. It was this conviction, we believe, more than any thing else, which led to the result reached. That result, therefore, was another verdict against the Lancaster-Mercersburg movement.

Other reflections naturally suggest themselves. For the present, however, we must desist, only adding in conclusion, that the church has reason to thank the Lord as well for what was done as for what was not done, by the General Synod of Cincinnati. Only let the great advantages secured, be followed up with proper, earnest energy and activity in the interest of that cause of Evangelical Christianity, which the late Synod declared, by its acts, to be held as of immeasurably greater account than any attempts to resuscitate, on Protestant grounds, some of the most pernicious errors of the fourth and succeeding centuries, and to revolutionize the Reformed church into a society for the propagation of Popery under disguise.

No one will be deluded with the hope that the contest is over. Lancaster has already issued its edict to the contrary. The sage *Messenger* even has incautiously betrayed a determination to keep up or renew the conflict. But, after the encouraging experience at Cincinnati, the fast friends of the blessed cause of old truth can more hopefully maintain the contest, and more confidently toil and pray for the desired result.

---

THE movement in favor of compulsory education makes decided progress. It is a matter nearly connected with the safety of our national life and institutions. There need be no fear of universal suffrage, if, as Mr. Beecher recently said, the voters go to the ballot-box through the school-house.

## ELDER DUNN AND THE MESSENGER.

THE following article was originally sent to the *Reformed Church Messenger*. There was every reason of justice, courtesy, and Christian equity, for allowing it to appear in that paper. It was in the *Messenger* that the writer believed himself and his case to have been wronged by a public misrepresentation. He had a right to demand the privilege of a public correction of the wrong, if that correction was made in no improper terms. That his article is free to a remarkable extent from all improprieties of statement or expression, will be seen by every one who reads it. This, Dr. Fisher himself, will be compelled to acknowledge. And yet he refuses Elder Dunn a hearing in self-defence. The reason given for the refusal was, that to publish the article *would probably provoke controversy!* The *Messenger* may publish a man to the church as "a contentious elder," a troublesome man, and may misrepresent him as it or its favorite correspondents may choose. This will not provoke a controversy. But if the injured seeks such redress as even a common secular or political paper would not refuse, under the circumstances, the editor of the *Messenger of the Reformed church*, in which the party wronged may be an elder, or a minister, will shut the door in his face, and tell him he can't come in there to make trouble and "excite controversy."

And yet the *Messenger* and its editor wish to be considered *neutral* and impartial in regard to the present controversy in the church! Such neutrality! Such impartiality! Will the church be any longer deceived by its false pretences, or blindfolded by its occasional affectation of soft and soothing words?

Of course we give place to the rejected article. It is right to publish it. Not only equity, but common justice to Elder Dunn, demands its publication. It is due to the church and to truth, that this new attempt at misrepresenting facts (which seems to be a peculiar weakness of some natures), if they have been misrepresented, should be exposed. The importance of the matter treated, is proven by the labored attempt of the *Messenger* to take the edge from the action of the General Synod in the case. This importance furnishes an additional reason for publishing Elder Dunn's plain, straightforward, unanswerable correction.

THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

A CORRECTION.

*Mr. Editor:* I desire the use of your columns, if you please, to correct some errors in your article in the *Messenger* of the 22d inst., "On the action of the last General Synod. No. 5. The Dunn Appeal." You, no doubt, as the editor of a religious journal, wish only to furnish your readers with the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And now, since you, in your carefully written article, have failed to present all the facts in the case, no doubt because you have been misinformed, you will surely, I think, allow one intimately acquainted with the case from the beginning, to make a plain statement of them. The case is represented as originating in Huntingdon. This is a small mistake. Although the first action of our Consistories was taken here, yet the case which originated the Appeal started at *McConnellstown*.

As documentary evidence in relation to facts, will, I presume, be allowed to be the best evidence, I will give you a few quotations from our Church Records. And first, as far back as August 31, 1867, at a meeting of the Joint Consistories, the following resolution sent down from the Classis held that year, was adopted: "*Resolved*, That Classis earnestly recommends all the congregations to take up alms at every regular public service, to be devoted by vote of the Consistory to strictly benevolent purposes, and that the current expenses of the congregation be provided for in some other way."

Then, the first action taken by the Consistory of the Huntingdon congregation bearing on the subject, was at a regular quarterly meeting, held June 3, 1871, as follows: "On motion, it was *Resolved, unanimously*, That our alms be sent to the institutions of our church in the West, in care of Rev. Geo. W. Williard, D.D., with the request that he render us a statement, showing the uses to which the money will be applied."

And four days later, on the 7th of June, 1871, the evening before the annual meeting of the Mercersburg Classis at Bedford, the McConnellstown Consistory passed the same resolution. Our pastor, in his parochial report, called the attention of the Classis to these resolutions, stating the amount of money which was made unavailable for the objects of the Classis in this way. The Classis referred the matter to a special committee, before whom the pastor, the delegated elder and myself, (I being the *secundus*) appeared; and after a pretty long conference with the committee, I agreed to use my influence with the Huntingdon Consistory to have the resolution reconsidered; giving notice, however, on the floor of Classis, that we would claim the right to act again in the same matter whenever we saw proper, and in whatever form we deemed best. The reason which induced the delegated elder and myself, in our private conference, to agree to reconsider that resolution, was because we feared it was not in the best form to go up to Synod; and besides, the action at McConnellstown was irregular, inasmuch as the meeting had not been regularly called. The McConnellstown Consistory, the same summer, shortly after the meeting of Classis at Bedford, took the following action: "*Whereas*, diversities of sentiment exist in our church, and the last General Synod expressly provided, that



those entertaining such differences of opinion, should be allowed full liberty in regard to them; *Therefore, Resolved*, That in accordance with said action, the alms of this congregation be sent by the treasurer of the Consistory to the different treasurers of the Benevolent Boards of the General Synod; the Consistory to designate at the time a particular student and a particular missionary to whom our contributions are to be appropriated."

This preamble, together with the resolution, was carried by a unanimous vote, all the members being present—the pastor alone objecting. This action was taken on Saturday evening, and the pastor the next day, after morning service, announced it to the congregation in a way that gave considerable offence to the Consistory. An earnest elder, feeling that the pastor was not giving a full and fair representation of the case, asked him to read the resolution itself; he answered, that he had no copy, but asked the elder to read it, who proceeded to give the substance of it, not having a copy, but being familiar with it. The pastor then told the congregation that all those who did not wish to devote their alms to the purposes indicated by the Consistory, might withhold them, and give him their money at the end of the month, and he would send it where they wished it to go. I have been told by the deacons of that congregation, that that portion of the people who sympathized with the pastor, did not contribute after that. One of the deacons, who always attended, told me that he for some time attended to lifting the alms of the whole congregation himself, and noticed particularly that the Mercersburg party gave nothing. When the Consistory took action to appropriate the alms so contributed, which was on the 20th day of April, 1872, they did it in this way: (I copy from their minutes.) "Joseph Isenberg offered the following resolution in regard to the alms on hand: *Resolved*, That the alms now on hand be appropriated as follows: Twenty dollars to a young man in Ursinus College, (George Resser), and the balance to home missions, which after some discussion was adopted. Rev. Steckel gave notice of his intention to complain to Classis in regard to the above action."

The complaint was carried up to Classis by the pastor, and referred to a committee, but the case was virtually acted on by Classis before the committee reported. When the roll on Beneficiary Education was called, and the Huntingdon charge having been reported thirty-six dollars and some cents in arrears, the pastor referred to me to answer why that assessment was not met; when I informed Classis that the body of our people had become unwilling to support students at Mercersburg, and that we claimed credit for the twenty dollars sent to Mr. Resser, at Ursinus, which credit, after a protracted discussion, extending over the noon adjournment, was allowed, by the adoption of the preamble and resolution offered by Rev. M. H. Sangree; but which the Stated Clerk of our Classis, it seems, failed to furnish you for publication, thus leaving our arrearage to be reported finally in the minutes, at sixteen dollars and some cents only.

Now, Mr. Editor, in view of these facts, it seems to me that every unbiased mind can see at once, that the following passage in your article cannot be true: "According to the testimony of the pastor, the congregation was publicly apprised by him that the benevolent contributions to be raised during the year, were to be applied to the specific purposes designated by the Classis in its assessments."

Such notice, I feel confident, was never given in any of our congregations. If it had been, it would have produced such a sensation that it could not be forgotten so soon. I have shown the article in question to quite a number of our people here, and at McConnellstown, and they all say there was no such notice given. And I have consulted persons of both sexes, and on both sides of the church question, and those who are in the habit of attending church regularly. This passage occurs in the last paragraph of your description of "the case as it appeared before the Synod," (of Martinsburg.) I was at that Synod, and know that the pastor referred to, was not there at all to give any evidence in person, and I know no evidence from him was read. In short, I know that no such evidence was offered either there or at the court below. I know not, of course, how the matter was talked over privately between the Mercersburg party at the Synod of Martinsburg; but I paid particular attention to the trial, and am aware that as many gratuitous assertions were made, and as many hypothetical theories advanced by the accomplished advocate of the Classis, as he deemed necessary to make out a case of that refined sophistry to which he is wont to resort, when he knows he cannot meet the case in hand in the way of legitimate argument. But I paid but little attention to these, knowing such things were not evidence. Indeed, the resolution appealed from, was adopted at Classis, without any discussion, and after our case had been entirely disposed of by the adoption of the Sangree resolution already referred to.

If anything like the quotation in question had been offered as evidence at the Synod of Martinsburg, as was attempted on that side at the General Synod, in the way of a definite statement of the fact of the case, I would have been as ready to rectify it, if allowed, as I was at the General Synod.

After stating the case in your own form, you complacently say in the concluding sentence on the action of our district Synod, that "the case as thus stated was a clear one." I assure you, Mr. Editor, if such had been the case, no appeal would ever have been taken.

The object of the appeal was not the alienation of funds, but an earnest, conscientious struggle to vindicate our right to promote with our means, as well as our prayers, as far as we could instrumentally, the true Reformed cause, in doctrine and mode of worship, as we understand it, in accordance with the freedom allowed by the General Synod of 1869, and the word of God.

Huntingdon,  
January 31, 1873. }

D. D.

---

OFFICIAL AND PERSONAL.

BELIEVING it desirable to preserve the following official paper, with the accompanying letter, and the reply to it, in a permanent form, and that the matter will be of general interest to our readers, they are published in the *Monthly*. The counsel with which the

letter of the committee closes, may seem to some persons rather assumptive and gratuitous. This may be accounted for, by considering the peculiar time, place and circumstances under which it was written. Sometimes a very bold assumption and charge of guilt has driven innocent persons into hurtful submission or concessions. What has happened may happen again. This may possibly explain the peculiar terms and tone of the concluding admonition of the letter:

"The following paper was submitted to Synod, and after considerable discussion, adopted:

*Whereas*, The Constitution of the Reformed church declares the office of teacher of theology to be a distinct office;

*And, whereas*, According to the same organic law, the Synod alone has the power to establish and govern a Theological Seminary, and appoint professors or teachers of theology;

*And, whereas*, No minister has the right to assume the office of teacher of theology, unless he has been chosen by a majority of the votes of the Synod, and has been duly inaugurated by taking the prescribed oath of office;

*And, whereas*, Teachers of theology are required to prescribe a course of study for the students, and conduct all their instructions under the direction and supervision of a board of visitors appointed by the Synod;

*And, whereas*, According to public announcement, the Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., a member of the Philadelphia Classis, and President of Ursinus College, a chartered literary institution, is, along with others, conducting a theological class or school, and preparing men for the ministry of the gospel by giving these professedly a full course of theological instruction, although he has not been appointed to the office of teacher of theology, and has never been inaugurated agreeably to the requirements of the Constitution.

*Therefore, Resolved*: 1. That the conduct of the said member of the Philadelphia Classis, in assuming the office of teacher of theology and in giving theological instruction independently of any proper ecclesiastical supervision and direction, is contrary to the Constitution and government of the Reformed church, and therefore disorderly.

2. That this Synod hereby enjoins upon the aforesaid minister of the Philadelphia Classis, forthwith to desist from this disorder.

3. That a committee of three be appointed to communicate an official copy of this action to the Rev. Dr. Bomberger, and in case he does not respect this injunction, it shall be their duty, and they are hereby directed to institute such constitutional proceedings as shall be necessary to maintain the order of the church.

The Revds. Dr. Samuel R. Fisher, John M. Titzel, and Elder Daniel W. Gross were appointed the committee called for in above action."

A true extract from the Minutes of the Synod of the Reformed church in the United States, held in Martinsburg, West Va., in the month of October, A. D. 1872. So certifies,

SAMUEL R. FISHER, Stated Clerk.



*The General Synod at Cincinnati.*

145

MARTINSBURG, West Va., Oct. 23, 1872.

*To the Rev. Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger :*

Dear Brother: In compliance with the duty assigned us by the Synod of the Reformed church in the United States, we transmit to you the above extract from the Minutes of the late annual session of said Synod, certified by its Stated Clerk, and bespeak for it your earnest and respectful attention. We shall be pleased to learn from you at as early a day as possible, the disposition you shall feel constrained to make of the matter submitted to your attention by Synod, and trust it may be such as shall become an obedient son of the church, and relieve yourself from all conflict with the authority of the Synod.

Yours, most respectfully,

SAMUEL R. FISHER,  
JOHN M. TITZEL,  
DANIEL W. GROSS, } Com. of Synod of Ref. Church, U. S.

URSINUS COLLEGE, January 29, 1873.

To the REV. S. R. FISHER, D.D.,  
REV. J. M. TITZEL,  
ELDER D. W. GROSS, } Committee, &c.

Brethren: Your letter, officially transmitting a copy of the action of the Synod of Martinsburg, pronouncing me disorderly for giving instruction in the Theological Department of Ursinus College, and commanding me immediately to desist from such duty, was duly received. As an appeal, in constitutional form had been taken from said action to the General Synod of the Reformed church, then soon to convene in Cincinnati, and as it was confidently believed that the highest judicatory of the church would, in its calm and impartial judgment, sustain the appeal and reverse the action of the Martinsburg Synod, an immediate answer to your letter was deemed unnecessary.

But, as I have always felt it to be my privilege and duty to cherish and manifest proper respect to the courts of the church, and have given uniform proof of this in past times, I will not now disregard a ruling principle of my public life. Allow me, therefore, herewith formally and respectfully to acknowledge the receipt of your communication; and in reply, through you, to assure the Synod you represent in this case, that I fully appreciate the zeal avowed for maintaining the constitutional integrity of the church, even though displayed in this instance in what was with deference believed to be an unwarranted manner; and further to assure the Synod, that I shall ever hold myself ready to show due respect to the constitutional acts of the Reformed Synod, and to render proper obedience to all lawful and equitable requirements.

As the late General Synod of our church annulled the action of the Synod of Martinsburg, it would be superfluous for me to add more in regard to the matter. Only allow me to acknowledge thankfully the wholesome counsel with which you close your letter, and to express the hope that you will ever cordially unite with me, and others, in treating all the acts of all our church Synods in a manner "such as shall become obedient sons of the church, and so relieve yourselves from all conflicts with the authority" of those Synods.

In the faith and obedience of the Gospel of Christ,

Most respectfully yours,

J. H. A. BOMBERGER.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

### CICERO'S DREAM OF SCIPIO.

[In the last book of his treatise, entitled *De Republica*, Cicero introduces a so-called *dream of Scipio*. The Scipio to whom the dream is imputed, was Africanus the younger, and died by assassination, about 20 years before Cicero's birth. It is most probable that the dream was fictitious, invented by the author for the purpose of illustrating some points in his treatise, and exciting livelier interest in them. In the dream, Scipio imagines himself translated from earth to some brilliant point in the Milky Way, where he is met by the spirit of his long previously deceased ancestor, the elder Scipio Africanus, who then favors him with a forecasting of his future destiny. The Lælius mentioned, was an intimate friend and associate of Scipio. In the subjoined translation of the dream furnished by a kind contributor to this department of the *Monthly*, the reader will find several allusions to religious topics, which add to its interest. Scipio is represented by Cicero as narrating the incident to some friends.]

1. When I had come to Africa, a tribune, as you know, of soldiers, under the consul Manius Manlius, attached to the fourth legion, nothing was more eagerly desired by me, than to meet Masinissa, a king most friendly to our family, for just reasons. The old man, as I came to him, having embraced me, shed tears with me, and for some time afterwards looked up to heaven, and said: I thank thee, greatest sun, and ye other heavenly ones, that before I leave this life, I see in my kingdom, and in these dwellings, P. Cornelius Scipio, by whose very name I am refreshed; for never does the memory of that best and most invincible man pass from my mind. Then I ask him about his kingdom; he inquired of me about our republic; and after many words had been spoken in regard to these matters that day was far spent by

us. Then after having been entertained with royal magnificence, we continued the conversation until late in the night, whilst the old man spoke of nothing except about *Africanus*, (the elder) and called to mind not only all his deeds, but also his sayings. Then as we parted to retire to rest, a sounder sleep than usual embraced me, both on account of (the fatigue of) the journey, and because I had kept awake until so late in the night. During my sleep *Africanus* showed himself to me of such a form as was better known to me from his image than from himself, (occasioned I verily believe by that of which we had been conversing; for it often happens that our thoughts and conversation produce some such effect in sleep as that which *Enacus* states with regard to *Homer*, about whom indeed while awake he was accustomed very frequently to think and speak). As I recognized him, I verily tremble. But he said: recover thy self possession, dismiss thy fear, *Scipio*, and treasure up in thy memory what I shall say.

2. "Dost thou see yonder city, which, compelled by me to obey the Roman people, renews its old wars, and cannot remain quiet? (he was also showing Carthage from a lofty place, full of stars, brilliant and clear) to attack which thou dost now come as almost a common soldier! This city, in two years from the present, thou, as consul, shalt overthrow, and such a surname gained shall be gained by thyself as thou hast as yet merely by inheritance. When thou shalt have destroyed Carthage, celebrated a triumph, been censor, and as envoy visited Egypt, Syria, Asia and Greece, thou shalt again while absent, be chosen consul, shalt finish the greatest war, and destroy Numantia. But when thou shalt have been conveyed in a chariot to the Capitol, thou shalt find the republic disturbed by the counsels of my grandson; then it will be necessary that thou, *Africanus*, show to thy country the light of thy spirit, thy genius, and thy wisdom. In relation, however, to this period (of thy life) I see the route of the fates uncertain, as it were. For when thy age shall have completed eight times seven annual revolutions of the sun, and these two numbers, each of which is considered as a perfect one, the one for a different reason from the other, shall have finished the fatal sum for thee by their natural circuit, in thee alone, and in thy name the whole state will place her hope; to thee the senate, all good men, the allies, and the Latins will look; thou wilt be one on whom the safety of the state will depend; and not to say more, it will be necessary that thou as dictator put



the republic on a sure basis, if indeed thou shalt have escaped the impious hands of thy relatives." Then when Lælius had cried out (as in amazement) and the rest had groaned more intensely (as if horrified) Scipio, gently laughing said: I beg you not to disturb my sleep, or break my vision. Hear the rest.

3. "But that thou, Africanus, mayest be more active in keeping the republic safe, know well, that, for all who have preserved, assisted, and enriched their native country, there is a particular place designated in the heavens, where they may enjoy everlasting bliss; for nothing indeed which happens on the earth is more acceptable to the supreme God, who governs this entire universe, than the councils and assemblies of men formed into social bodies under (the government of) law, which are called states; the rulers and preservers of these setting out hence, return *hither*." Then I, although I was terrified, not so much by the fear of death, as by the fear of (intimated) treachery from my own relatives, nevertheless asked whether both father Paulus himself lived, and the others who we thought were dead. "Yes, indeed," he said, "those live who have escaped from the bonds of their bodies, as it were from a prison; but your life, as it is called, is death. But dost thou not see father Paulus coming to thee?" When I saw him, I assure you I shed a profusion of tears. He embracing and kissing me, sought to restrain me from weeping. As soon as I, having suppressed my weeping, was able to speak, I asked, saying, "most revered and best father, since such is life, as I hear Africanus say, why do I tarry on the earth? Why do I not hasten to go thither to you. It may not be so, he replied. For unless that God, to whom all this temple belongs which thou dost see, has freed thee from the custody of the body, an approach thither can not be open for thee. For all men have been brought forth in accordance with this law, to be faithful guardians of that globe which thou seest in the middle of this temple, which is called earth; to these a soul has been given from those everlasting fires, which you call constellations and stars; which, globular and round, animated with divine minds, complete their circuits and orbits with wonderful swiftness. Wherefore, both thou, Publius, and all pious ones must keep the soul in charge of the body; neither without the order of him by whom it has been given to you, may you leave human life, lest you seem to have refused to accept a human office assigned you by the Deity. But even,

Scipio, as this thy grandfather, as I who have begotten thee, exercise justice and cherish piety, which while it is great in the case of parents and relatives, is greatest especially in the case of one's country; such a life is the way to heaven, and to that assembly of those who at one time lived and having been relieved of the body, now inhabit that place which thou seest (for the whole circuit was shining with most resplendent brightness, amid blazing stars), which you, as you have learned from the Greeks, call the Milky Way," from which to me contemplating (them), all other things seemed very glorious and wonderful. But such were the stars (for brightness) as we never beheld from this place, that is the earth; and such the magnitude of all as we never suspected to exist; of which that was the least which, most remote from the heavens, nearest to the earth, was shining with borrowed light. The globes of the stars far surpassed the magnitude of the earth. For the earth itself seemed so small to me, that I felt sorry for our Roman dominion, with which we touch, as it were, merely a point of it.

J. S. W.

---

[THE subjoined article is another of the addresses delivered at the Anniversary of the Schaff Literary Society, at the close of the last term, and also furnished at our request. In the April and succeeding numbers of the *Monthly*, our readers may expect similar contributions from orators of the Zwinglian Society, an announcement of whose Anniversary will be found among the *College Items*.]

#### UNITY OF SOCIETY.

A thought that deeply impresses a most reflecting man, is the connection between all the parts of the universe. One Creator has made all, and has made all to work in harmony and order. Planets revolve around their sun, moons around their primaries. The glittering hosts of stars which gem the heavens, are all in perfect harmony and order with each other. Each has its place. They are governed by certain laws, and no one interferes with the other. The same law holds good in the moral world. There is a universal mind. Truth is omnipresent. It *must* everywhere pre-

vail. Every individual must admit the truth ; so there is a general conscience, the individual conscience is in harmony with it. All the parts depend upon one another ; and so *we* are parts of a common humanity. We are a society. Society has its individual members, and each has a part to perform. No one can be left free ; there is room for all. Just as the body has its limbs, head, and other parts, society has a place for every one.

An immensity of operations, trades, professions, and callings, are everywhere placed before us. There is a vast shade of difference between them all, and can be adapted to each and every one.

There is an immense work ; but every one can fall in somewhere. A work so vast ! then every one is needed, and every one has something to do. As is the case with the body, the head cannot dispense with the arm or any other organ ; so the world needs all its individual parts. Man must not let his powers lie dormant within him, but let him who desires to see others happy, make haste to give whilst his gift may be enjoyed ; and remember, that every moment of delay takes away something from the value of his benefaction. And let him who proposes his own happiness reflect, that whilst he forms his purpose, the day rolls on, and "the night cometh when no man can work." He who is accustomed to turn aside from the world and commune with himself in retirement, will, sometimes at least, hear the truths which the multitude do not tell him. A more sound instructor will raise his voice and awaken within his heart those latent suggestions which the world had overpowered and suppressed. But solitude alone can never make a man happy. Here, then, the relation between the parts becomes evident. No one can separate himself from the world or from the whole, without injury to himself and injury to others. No one can act in selfishness without injuring himself. The miller of Mansfield cared for no one, because no one cared for him ; he became gloomy and separated himself from the world and became miserable. He found, that only as he lived for others, could he enjoy life. The world appears not, then, originally made for the private convenience of one man alone ! It does not. There is benefit in coöperation. Even in the manufacture of a needle there are many things to be done. Digging the ore, making the iron, polishing, and a vast number of operations. If one man should attempt to do all, he would fail ; but by a number coöperating, each part is made perfect, each one has his place



and part to perform; all work harmoniously. The law of charity requires that each should assist his neighbor. Selfishness would produce enmity and isolation. As each one in distress craves for assistance, he must give that assistance to others. We *must* coöperate one with another. The law of citizenship requires coöperation. Each has a duty to perform towards his country and neighborhood. The law of the *church* requires coöperation. "Bear ye one another's burdens." If one suffers, all suffer with him.

Hence, we find the law of sympathy, which dwells even in beasts, and more so in men. Is there a man upon the face of the earth, who would deliberately accept of all the wealth which this world can bestow, if offered to him upon the severe terms of his being unconnected with a single mortal whom he could love, or by whom he should be beloved? This would be to lead the wretched life of a detested tyrant, who, amidst suspicions and alarms, passes his miserable days a stranger to every tender sentiment, and utterly precluded from the heartfelt satisfactions of friendship. Extinguish all emotions of the heart, and what difference will remain—I do not say between man and brute, but between man and a mere inanimate clod. Away, then, with those austere philosophers, who represent virtue as hardening the soul against all the softer impressions of humanity! Selfishness is a starving vice. He who does no good, gets no good. He is like the heath in the desert, neither yielding fruit nor seeing when good cometh; a stunted, dwarfish, miserable shrub. Would you prosper? Then only keep self out of view, and feel an interest in the welfare of others. This will not only interest others in you, but will tend to stifle selfishness in your own heart, and to cultivate disinterested feeling. The positive and contentious, the rude and quarrelsome, are the bane of society. They seem destined to blast the small share of comfort which nature has here allotted to man, but they cannot disturb the peace of others more than they break their own. The hurricane rages first in their own bosom before it is let forth upon the world. In the tempests which they raise, they are always tossed, and frequently it is their lot to perish. If you would be happy in yourselves or in your connections with others, then guard against that malignant spirit. Study that charity "which thinketh no evil." Thus you shall be kept free from that continual irritation which imaginary injuries raise in a suspicious breast, and you shall walk among men as your brethren, not as your enemies. A

man must cultivate a kind, generous and sympathizing temper, which feels for distress wherever it is beheld ; which enters into the concerns of his friends with ardor, and which treats all as human. How amiable appears such a disposition, when compared with that of a malicious or envious one, which wraps itself up in its own narrow interest, looks with an evil eye upon the success of others, and with an unnatural satisfaction feeds on their disappointments and miseries ! How little does *he* know of the true happiness of life, who is a stranger to that intercourse of good offices and kind affections, which, by a pleasing charm, attaches men to one another, and circulates joy from heart to heart.

Children of men ! men formed by nature to live and feel as brethren ! how long will you continue to estrange yourselves from one another by competitions and jealousies, when in cordial union you might be so much blest ? How long will you seek your happiness in selfish gratifications alone, while those around you are crying for assistance ? Let there be unity ; let there be coöperation in all things, and it will advance the good of your nation, for "in union there is strength." And let us remember, that "no man liveth to himself alone;" but if he wishes to fulfill his mission on earth, he must live for his neighbors, his country, and above all, to his God.

C. H. C.

---

COLLEGE ITEMS. The following announcement is kindly furnished in advance of the regular programme, and cheerfully published.

The ZWINGLIAN SOCIETY will celebrate its third Anniversary on Tuesday evening, March 27, 1873. The literary exercises of the anniversary will consist of orations by the following members, chosen for the purpose :

Salutatory, by Geo. S. Sorber; to be followed by Albert Johnson, H. J. Welker, A. E. Dahlman, Jos. H. Hunsberger and F. F. Barner.

This Society, not yet three years old, has had no small measure of success, and is at present in a flourishing condition. Its approaching anniversary, which occurs, by a new College arrange-

ment, somewhat in advance of the regular time for holding it, promises to be one of great interest, and is anticipated by the members and friends with zealous pleasure.

*The Winter Term of the College* will close on March 27. The Spring Term will open on *April 6th*. All desiring to enter the school at the time, should make early application. Persons desiring catalogues will be promptly supplied by addressing any member of the Faculty.

---

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*Receipts for the Monthly will be found duly credited on the label containing the subscriber's address.* Thus those whose previous credit on the label was to Jan. 71, and who have sent \$6 will find their credit changed to Jan. 74; those who sent \$4, will find their credit changed to Jan. 73, and hence they are still back for the present year. Those whose previous credit reached to Jan. 73, and who have forwarded \$2, will find their credit changed to Jan. 74. *This, according to our terms, should be the credit on every label,* and by promptly attending to this small matter for each one, the money-part of our burden would be greatly lightened. We thank those who are so considerate in this respect as to pay the due promptly, and their number is not small. But the *Monthly* is published at a price which, for its size (672 pages a year,) is a marvel to those who know the cost of such publications, and has scarcely a parallel. To sustain it, however, on such low terms, it is absolutely necessary that every subscriber should pay up without delay. This should be easy and pleasant for every one. The friends of the cause and principles it represents and strives to serve, realize the value of the services it has rendered. Even its foes (and they have been many and bitter), have felt and confessed this. Then, let friends, of whom it has enough amply to sustain it, not neglect its claims and add to our cares by such mere inconsiderate neglect.

*What now?* Whenever the Mercersburg Theological School has been charged with holding and teaching doctrines utterly at variance with those of our church, and subversive of its faith, the charge has been repelled and denounced as false, libellous, &c. Those who have made the charge, including ourselves, have not only been proclaimed false accusers and troublers of the church, but have been declared worthy of prosecution before the Synod, for assailing the professors of its institutions, and have been threatened with such prosecution. Of course such threats have not frightened us from duty, but are treated as "hoot-ings" of night birds deserve to be treated.

Among other errors held and advocated by the school named is, that "deliver-



ance from the power of the devil and the gift of a new life" is, by divine ordination, communicated through water baptism. This is baptismal regeneration in the strongest form. So has the school been accused of holding and teaching on the ground of sermons preached and articles written by some of its chief representatives. And in thus teaching, it has been declared anti-Reformed. But Dr. Fisher has allowed the charge to be denied, and has himself tried, in the *Messenger*, to make it appear false—just as every other error of that party is glossed over and palliated.

In the last number of the *Mercersburg Review*, however, an article is published which takes bold and extreme ground in favor of baptismal regeneration, in the ultra-Lutheran or Romish sense. Without the least hesitation, without any qualms of conscience, a minister of the Reformed church advocates a theory of baptism which he has intelligence enough to know is not *Reformed*, but ultra-Lutheran, not evangelical Protestant, but utterly Romish.

What will the editor of the *Messenger* have to say now? Let him point out the difference between the doctrine of said article, and that of Romanism on the same subject, if he can, or let him forever cease to call charges false which are proven to hold against the party he seems to be so bent upon shielding from an exposure of its baneful errors.

If the Rev. C. Cort, of Iowa, paid as little regard to truth in his prosecution of the alleged *adultery* case which he has been laboring so hard to make infamous, as he has in certain recently published statements about ourselves, his testimony with reference to it is not worth the straw-paper on which it might be written. And if the bad spirit betrayed in making those statements moved his extraordinary zeal in that cause, he might find things contrary to New Testament morality of more immediate personal concern to think and write about, than about divorce. In a single period of eight lines, he has managed to crowd no less than five grossly false misstatements. The unhappy man seems to have been so engrossed with Matthew 5: 27, 32, that he has forgotten or wholly ignored the six preceding verses, as well as Matthew 7: 1, 5. It would doubtless be well for him to study and write about the grievous sins there named, and, in the former instance, with a most solemn threatening. This is all we have to say to Mr. Cort.

By an oversight, the article entitled *Two Types of Piety*, published in the January No., appeared without a signature. It was from the pen of Professor Super, and should have been so credited.

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

*From the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia:*

*Daily Meditations*, by Rev. George Bowen, American Missionary, Bombay India.

This volume of daily meditations has been before the Christian public long enough to have its merits fairly tested. It has stood the test, and been deservedly pronounced worthy of a place among the best aids to devotion ever published. The topics are selected with a discretion which gives evidence of a warm experimental familiarity with the doctrines and promises of grace in Jesus Christ, and a thoughtful, believing insight into revealed truth. Every Christian would find it a profitable and cheering daily companion. Price, \$1.50.

*Love Revealed*, (by the same author.) Meditations on the 13th—17th chapters of John. Pervaded by the like profoundly devotional spirit as the preceding work, by an equal vigor and clearness of statement and unequivocal exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of evangelical Christianity, this new volume from the pen of the zealous missionary, will prove a source of rich instruction and comfort to all who read it. Price, 1.50.

*George Paull*, of Benita, West Africa. A memoir by Rev. Samuel Wilson, D.D. Those who take any interest in Africa, and the work of missions in that long and deeply benighted land, will peruse with sad pleasure this memoir of one whose labors there were greatly blessed, though he was early called to his reward. The volume has been prepared chiefly for the *young*, and it is to be hoped will lead many to make an early consecration of themselves to the service of the Lord in heathen lands.

*From the American Sunday School Union*, 1122 Chestnut street, Philadelphia :

*The Boys at Eaglewood, or Life at School*. By Clara F. Guernsey.

Many interesting volumes for youths' libraries have made the name of this gifted writer familiar, not only to boys and girls, but to older people. In "Life at School," the authoress has selected not only a popular but an important theme. The school-days of children and youth, are days of moral probation as well as of mental instruction; days of temptation as well as opportunity. And any book, wisely composed, offering proper counsels and warnings for that momentous period in their history, deserves their careful perusal. This volume seems well suited to such a purpose, and imparts wholesome admonition and advice in an attractive form.

*From Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York :

*Commentary on Genesis*. By Right Rev. E. Harrold Browne, Lord Bishop of Ely, Author of "The Pentateuch in Reply to Colensa," etc. Price, \$1.50.

This volume is the first part of the first volume of "The Speaker's Commentary," favorably noticed some time ago. It is now published in a separate form in order to bring the valuable matter it contains within easy reach of many who might not feel able to buy the larger work, especially of Sunday school teachers who may be following the International Uniform Series of Lessons. In this compendious work, the leading difficulties of Genesis are honestly and learnedly met, and the objections of skeptics and unbelievers who have assailed Moses are ably refuted. The volume merits warm commendation. For whilst it does

not supersede the volume on Genesis in the great Bible Commentary of Lange, edited by Dr. Schaff, it is more generally accessible.

*Wonders of Scripture*, by Louis Viardot. Seventy-two engravings.

This is a translation of a recent French work, by an art-critic of high reputation, and forms one of the admirable and admirably gotten up series of wonders of art now in course of publication by the enterprising firm named. Although in viewing his subject from a French position, the author betrays some partiality, and is chargeable with oversights of English and American claims, the work is exceedingly interesting and valuable, and will be highly prized by all who have any taste for art. Price, \$1.50.

From *Claxton & Co.*, 821 Market street, Philadelphia :

"An Ecclesiastical History, from the 13th to the 19th Century. By *Rev. C. M. Butler*, D.D., Prof. of Ecclesiastical History in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal church, Philadelphia.

Without pretending to give anything more than an honest compilation, the author of this compend has furnished a concise text-book, in which the leading facts of church history are clearly stated and happily arranged. There is a manifest disproportion between the large space allotted to the Anglican (Episcopal) church in England and this country, and the comparatively few pages allowed to the history of at least equally important other branches of the Protestant church. But a fair apology for this may be found in the fact, that the volume is designed mainly as a text-book for Episcopal schools. Dr. Butler is a staunch defender, in his communion, of Evangelical principles in opposition to Puseyism.

*Bibliotheca Sacra and Theological Eclectic.* January, 1873. Edited by *Edward A. Park*, of Andover, and *Geo. E. Day*, of New Haven. Published by *Warren F. Draper*, of Andover, Mass.

Instead of a detailed statement of the valuable articles contained in the January number of this able Quarterly, which sustains fully its high reputation, we insert the following extracts from the publisher's advertisement for 1873.

"THIS standard Quarterly is devoted to able and elaborate discussions of questions in Theology, Biblical Literature, Church History, Philology, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Classical Learning. It is a periodical of the highest class, suited to the wants of ministers of all denominations, who value and seek to promote a thorough scholarship among the ministry. It is not sectarian, but admits articles from able writers among many different denominations.

The complete set of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* forms in itself a library on the most important topics, unequalled, in many respects, by any similar series, and is more frequently quoted as authority by English and American scholars, in the preparation of Cyclopedias, Bible Dictionaries, and other Biblical works, than any other work of the kind; see, for example, Hackett's Smith's Bible Dictionary.

A new volume commences with the January number, 1873.

Among the contributions for this volume will be the continuation of the very



valuable Articles on the Kingdom of Christ, by Professor Harris of New Haven; and on Rhetoric, by the late Professor George Shepard of Bangor. Professor Park will furnish a series of Articles on the Plan and Structure of a Sermon; Dr. J. P. Thompson of Berlin, will continue his Articles on Egyptology. Professor Barrows will conclude his series on Inspiration.

The work is handsomely printed on fine paper; each volume contains about 800 pages. The subscription price is \$4.00 per annum, in advance."

*Proceedings Connected with the Semi-Centennial Commemoration* of the Professorship of Rev. Charles Hodge, D.D., L.L. D., in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., April 24, 1872.

The occasion of these proceedings was at once most grateful and impressive. For half a century Dr. Hodge has adorned his place in the Theological School at Princeton, and exerted there, and in the still wider sphere of his own branch of the Reformed church, as well as in that church at large, a very potent and wholesome influence. It seemed most appropriate that the fiftieth anniversary of his professorial labors should be marked by suitable commemorative festivities. The Rev. Dr. Doles, of the United Presbyterian church, editor of the *Christian Instructor*, Philadelphia, who was present, says: "Never did we witness a great occasion with more of heart in it, and more of real intellect, piety and worth, in person or by letter, from all parts of the Christian world, to grace it. The leading address by Rev. Dr. Duryea, of Brooklyn; the affectionate address on behalf of the Alumni, by Rev. Dr. H. A. Boardman, of this city; and the numerous impromptu addresses, with the letters from persons at a distance, were all worthy of the occasion, and the Messrs. Randolph & Co. have done well to gather them here into this neat volume. Any person who was present will love to have it as a memorial of a great occasion of their lives. Any one who was not there ought to have it, that they may have before them a good life, and the hold it has upon multitudes to whom it has been a blessing."

*Bible Class Souvenir*, being the Third Annual report of the (adult) Bible Class of Salem Reformed church, Harrisburg, Pa. This class is under the care and instruction of Rudolph F. Kelker, esq., and is composed of young men and women, and some even of more advanced age. The Souvenir before us reports the annual statistics for the year 1872, personal events of interest relating to members of the class, and its present condition, with a catalogue of the members, officers, &c. The publication of this Souvenir by the class was a happy thought. No more flourishing Bible class could be found any where, and the testimony of the facts here gathered and published must be cheering to all engaged in the work. No less than 155 names are on the roll for the year; and at its close, after deductions by death, removal, &c., 126 still remained. A Sunday-school Bible Class of 126 members! What a field for usefulness, and what a power for good! It is comforting to know that the class is in the hands of one who so well realizes the responsibilities of the position, and who so earnestly strives to meet them.

"*College Days*" is a new, sprightly newspaper, published at

Lancaster, and devoted to the interests of Franklin and Marshall College. It is issued monthly, 8 pp., small quarto, at \$1 a year. The two numbers which have thus far appeared, exhibit a good degree of editorial tact, and promise well for the future.

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH.—*Ministerial Changes.*—Rev. H. H. Sandoe has accepted a call from Mt. Zion's charge. His address is Stonington, Christian county, Illinois.

Rev. H. King from Boeman to Stoutsville, Fairfield county, Ohio.

Rev. C. Hoffmeier has taken charge of Lutherburg charge, in Clarion Classis. His address is Troutville, Pa.

ADDITIONS TO CHURCHES.—Three persons were added to the Youngstown, Ohio, congregation.

Six persons were added to the Farmersville congregation, Rev. L. Rike, pastor.

Three persons were added to the Danville congregation, Rev. G. W. Snyder, pastor.

Orphans' Home, Womelsdorf, Pa., twelve of the orphans were added by confirmation.

Two persons were added to the congregation at Carson's Creek, Rev. P. C. Prugh, pastor.

Eight persons were added to the congregation at Pleasantville, Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock, pastor.

Eight persons were added to Emmanuel's congregation, Rev. S. H. Winters, pastor.

Seventy-five persons were added to the Sugar Grove congregation, Lancaster charge, Rev. Mr. Hale, pastor.

Sixteen persons were added to the Bethel congregation, Mt. Pleasant charge, Hill Grove, Ohio.

Seven persons were added to the Northampton congregation, Ohio, Rev. S. H. Winters, pastor.

DEDICATION OF CHURCHES.—Winchester, Va., the Reformed church of this place was re-dedicated the 26th of January, with appropriate services. Rev. A. R. Kremer preached morning and evening.

The German congregation at Casco, St. Clair county, Missouri, dedicated their new church the 22d of November. The congregation numbers eighty persons.

On Saturday, December 28th, the new St. Luke's church, in Woodcock Valley, was dedicated. The cost of the building and furniture are all paid for.

A special meeting of the Eastern Synod convened in Lancaster, Pa., on Wednesday, February 19th. The items claiming its attention were: 1. To take action on a proposed combination, in some form, of the Pittsburg Synod, and the new Synod about to be constituted of Zion's, Maryland, &c., Classes, in supporting the Theological Seminary at Lancaster.

2. To consider the subject of establishing Mission Institutes.

3. To provide for a coöperation of the three Synods named, in the work of Home missions. In the regard to the first point, constitutional difficulties were in the way, which seemed to be fairly insuperable. The plan proposed at the Synod of Martinsburg, and there approved, was clearly proven by Rev. G. B. Russell, in "*Our Church Paper*," to be in direct conflict with the Constitution. And yet, if a report published in the *Daily Express* of Lancaster is correct, that plan was adopted without material modification by the Special Synod. It might seem that a disregard or violation of the Constitution is of small account, when such violation can be made to further the schemes of certain parties in the East. But will the *General Synod* allow such infractions of the Constitution to stand? Will not many even of those who might desire to have the end contemplated, by what was done, secured, feel that the means employed in the efforts to reach that end are hardly justifiable, and that the object has been gained, if gained, at too great a cost?

Regarding the second point, there are in the East many warm advocates of what are called Mission-houses, or institutions for training pious men who desire to devote themselves to the work of the ministry, but whose advanced age and limited means, hinder their taken a full course of study. It appears, however that Lancaster disapproves of the measure, and it was voted down.

On the third item, favorable action was taken, so that the East will carry on its Home Mission work hereafter in some extra constitutional way.

Altogether this Synodical meeting seems to have inaugurated a new way of doing things, and one more seriously questionable than free, voluntary, non-official conventions. The "*Christian World*" of Cincinnati has grave impressions that the movement involves Schism with regard to the *General Synod*, and gives strong reasons for such impressions. We await further developments. The attendance at the Synod would appear to have been very small. But two delegates, so far as we have learned, were there from the Classis of Philadelphia; and those two, secundi, or alternates, Dr. Fisher, and Elder J. D. Miller, of the Book-store.

Rev. T. H. Winters, pastor of the Union Charge, Clarke co., Ohio, recently added eight members to one of his congregations. Since his pastorate in the field, 200 members have been added to the churches composing the charge.

Other items of interest are necessarily postponed.

THE following sketch of our deceased Bro. Lantz, whose death was noticed in February, has been furnished by a young friend:

*Death of Rev. John Lantz.*—The death of this highly esteemed minister in the Reformed Church was sudden and unexpected. It occurred in Taneytown,



Md., on the evening of the 26th of January, after he had suffered only a short time, though intensely.

Mr. Lantz was a native of North Carolina, and was born in Lincoln county, some time in the spring of 1812.\* His paternal ancestors were immigrants from Lehigh co., Pa., and the residence of his grandfather may still be seen there.

As to the early life and education of Mr. Lantz, we know but little, having received only a few facts from his bereaved family. When a young man, he received a course of instruction in the Heidelberg Catechism, by Rev. J. G. Fritchey, then of the Reformed church in N. C., and at a proper time was admitted as a full member of the church. Being convinced of his call to the gospel ministry, he devoted himself closely to study with a view to this end. He attended the "High-school" in Lincolnton, N. C., for some time, and also received private instruction from Rev. Fritchey, during which time he acquired an English and classical education. He then attended the Theological Seminary, at York, Pa., two years, and in the fall of 1837, he was licensed by the Synod of the Reformed church, held at Sunbury, Pa. He then returned home to N. C., and was soon called to the *Rowan Charge*, including a number of churches both in Rowan and Cabarrus counties. In this charge he labored for many years, and was highly esteemed and loved, not only by his own members, but by all who knew him. He had occasion to tell the writer that he would have remained there longer, but for the ill health of his family. This was the cause of his removal to Newton, N. C., situated in a more healthful district, where he labored as a minister until the fall of 1868, when he removed to Virginia, and labored in the Middlebrook charge until about a year ago he accepted a call to the Taneytown charge, where he died.

He was quite an acceptable preacher, as is manifest from the success with which he met, and the high esteem in which he was held. He was social and interesting in conversation; and, but what few can do, he could adapt himself to the different grades of society as is commonly found in all portions of the church.

His last charge was in a bad condition when he first entered; but by prudence, work, and his good Christian example, he had almost healed up the old wounds. He was holding a series of meetings in Taneytown when he took sick, and was doing a good work.

During his illness his members manifested much sympathy for him and family by numerous acts of kindness, and in the many prayers offered for his recovery. As he was perfectly conscious till the last moment, they could not believe he was taking his leave.

Though an unfavorable day, many were present at the funeral, which took place on the 28th of January. The sermon was preached by Rev. J. M. Titzel, on 2 Tim. i, 10, and a short address was delivered by Rev. N. E. Gilds. Revs. W. C. Cremer, J. N. Souder and A. R. Kremer were present, and participated in the service. Revs. Johnson and Bergstresser, of the Lutheran church, and Patterson of the Presbyterian, attended. The remains of Mr. Lantz were deposited in the cemetery of the Reformed church, in Taneytown, there to await the final resurrection. The church in town is still decked in mourning for his death. The deeply afflicted family left by Mr. Lantz have many sympathizers

\* This may be incorrect.

among their new neighbors and acquaintances. God, in His kind providence, saw fit to call to Himself His faithful servant, who was a kind husband and father; but may He ever be with and protect the afflicted who are left behind.

F.

To the preceding obituary it is our sad duty to add another, that of the *Rev. Wm. A. Good*, of Reading, Pa., who was suddenly called to his eternal rest on the afternoon of Sunday, February 9, whilst his family was attending church. Though he had been indisposed for some time, he seemed to be improving. But at the time named, as "in the twinkling of an eye," death struck his heart, and he expired. He had reached his 63d year. A deeply afflicted widow, and two sorrowing sons survive to deplore their loss.

It was our privilege in earlier years to be intimately acquainted, and for a short time, in the Preparatory School at Mercersburg, officially associated with the departed brother. The memory of his truly Christian character, kind-heartedness, and courteous manners is pleasantly cherished, though now with mournful vividness.

From a notice in the *Hausfreund*, by Dr. Bausman, the editor, we gather the following facts:

The Rev. Wm. A. Good was born in Philadelphia. Of five brothers, four became ministers in the Reformed church. The youngest brother died whilst pursuing a course of theological studies in Mercersburg. The Rev. Dr. J. H. Good, and Rev. Prof. Good, of Tiffin, Ohio, are brothers of the deceased. Three sisters still survive, one of whom is the wife of Rev. W. K. Zieber, of Hanover.

He pursued his theological studies mainly in York, under Dr. L. Mayer, and graduated in 1832. As a pastor he successively labored in the Hagerstown, York, Berneville and Tremont charges. He also occupied several important educational positions. For several years he was rector of the Preparatory School of Marshall College. Then he became principal of the Hagerstown Academy. After removing to Reading he had charge of a Female Seminary, and for three years was principal of the Reading Institute and Normal School. For some time, also, he filled the post of Superintendent of Public Schools in Berks county, and during that period organized many Sunday-schools in the county. During the last eight years he lent efficient aid in organizing and sustaining mission Sunday-schools in Reading, assisted by his devoted wife.

He was universally esteemed, and died deplored by all who knew him. A diligent student all his life, a ripe scholar, a sincere Christian, his life was devoted to good works, his death was peaceful, in the blessed hope of the Gospel and his rest in heaven, we may confidently believe, is that reserved for those who are faithful unto death.

A private letter from Rev. Dr. McCauley informs us that the funeral took place in St. Paul's Reformed church on Friday, February, 11. Twelve Reformed ministers of Reading and the vicinity attended, with other clergymen of the city. A highly appropriate sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. Bausman, on Luke 12: 37.

At the close of the services the following paper was read by A. F. Boas, esq. :

*Action of the S. S. T. A. of the Reformed Churches of Reading, Pa.* At a meeting of the Sunday-school Teachers Association of the Reformed churches of Reading, Pa., held on February 14, 1873, the following action was taken:

Our kind Heavenly Father, in His inscrutable wisdom has removed our brother and co-worker, the Rev. Wm. A. Good, into his everlasting rest. He has been a veteran in the Sunday-school cause, and one of the founders of this association. In this good work he has been pleasantly and usefully associated with us for a period of eight years. We have learned the value of his labors, and the many noble traits of his Christian character. The affability and gentleness of his disposition, his ripe scholarship, his kindness and deference to those under his care and tuition, his love for and devotion to the religious education of the young, his pleasant social qualities, all these have endeared him to us, and still endear him. In his death we lose a faithful leader, an able instructor, a tender, true, and sympathizing friend. The true Christian never dies; his death is but a brief sleep. Thus he lies before us to-day in a peaceful slumber, from which he awaits a coming waking. We love him still, and will cherish his memory with unfading affection. He still lives, lives immortally, and loves us and our cause as heretofore. Hopefully we mourn his departure. Prayerfully we will strive to improve the lessons of his useful life and sudden death. His startling sudden death, how it admonishes us, "*Be ye also ready.*" His useful life, how it teaches lessons of unselfish, unrequited work for souls. By the pastors and Sunday-school teachers of the Reformed churches of Reading, be it hereby—

*Resolved*, That we will endeavor to make a pious improvement of this bereavement of divine Providence, seeking to redouble our diligence in the work of our Master; to be more faithfully prompt and prayerful in the discharge of our duties, and by zealously promoting the cause so near to his heart, perpetuate the memory of the departed.

*Resolved*, That whilst we heartily condole with his bereaved family, and extend to them our sympathy, we will fervently pray that the God of all consolation may sustain and comfort them in their great sorrow.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of this Association be instructed to furnish the family with a copy of these proceedings, and to have them published in the *Reformed Church Messenger* and the *Christian World*.

HORATIO JONES, President.

J. B. FRICKER, Secretary.

THE POPE THINKING OF COMING TO AMERICA.—The Pope gave audience to several American naval officers last week, and is reported to have asked them how he would be received in America? The officers replied, that the people of the United States would regard his residence among them a great honor. By "people," in this case, these officers, no doubt, meant *Catholics*, and thus interpreted, their reply is, doubtless, correct. But then the Catholics and flunkies of this country are but a portion of the American people—and not the best nor wisest portion by any means. Of course his holiness does not intend to come here—his question was only a bit of infallible "buncombe."



WM. PAINTER & CO.,  
BANKERS,  
No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF  
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

---

Gold, Stocks and Bonds

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE  
*PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.*

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.

---

MORNING SUNBEAMS

For the playroom, Schoolroom, and Nursery. Selected by Mrs. E. Prentiss for the little folks, to hang on their chamber and schoolroom walls, like the "Silent Comforter" in hospitals, and furnish a divine talisman for every day. Folio. 32 pp. 75c.; post. 10c.

PRAYER.

A new and attractive devotional manual, containing suggestions and hints from our best writers, on the Lord's Prayer, and prayer in general. 104 pp. large 32mo. 20c.; post 4c.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT.

Lessons from Christ's conflict and victory. By Rev. A. F. Dickson. The teacher of youth, the tempted and the troubled Christian, will find it valuable. 144 pp. 18mo. 40c.; post 8c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISSELL,  
1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

SPRING TERM, 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The WINTER TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, will open on Monday, APRIL 7, 1873, and continue sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

WILLIAM H. SNYDER, Instructor in the Academic Department.

J. G. NEFF, Tutor.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.—APRIL, 1873.—No. 4.

---

THE SIMPLICITY THAT IS IN CHRIST.

THE following article is part of an earnest and instructive address delivered by the Rev. Dr. Nicholson, at the last anniversary of the American Church Missionary Society, (evangelical Episcopal) in March. The extracts are copied from the *American Church Missionary Register*, of New York.

The most urgent want of our times, is the knowledge of the simplicity that is in Christ. By the simplicity that is in Christ, I would be understood to mean especially these three things: First of all, the definiteness of the truth as it is in Jesus; secondly, the directness of our use of the truth as it is in Jesus; and thirdly, the authoritative clearness of the truth as it is in Jesus. These three things, I think, go to make up what the apostle calls the simplicity that is in Christ. Now, I shall run for a moment rapidly over a brief development of these three ideas, in order that we may appreciate the remark, that the great and urgent want of our times is the knowledge of this simplicity in Christ. I have said that the first element in this simplicity in Christ, is the definiteness of the truth as it is in Jesus. The truth of the gospel of the grace of God is *one*. It is many-sided, it is true, presenting to our view a vast variety of aspects, and yet that truth is one and the same in all aspects and in all relations. The fact that Jesus Christ represented us before God, was our substitute, took upon Him our sins, answered to the Divine Government for those sins in our behalf, and accomplished the work He undertook, insomuch that He could say, "It is



finished ;" the whole atonement has been rendered ; the entire satisfaction demanded by the justice of God has been made, and now there remains, so far as the salvation of the sinner is concerned, that he shall simply accept what Christ has thus done, and accept it in the person of that Christ, by taking Him in simple confidence to his own heart. This is in part an illustration of the definiteness of the truth as it is in Jesus. If we should say, if we should think, that there may by any possibility be the slightest chance of failure of salvation to any soul that thus accepts the Lord Jesus Christ, we should violate the simplicity that is in Christ, for that truth is definite ; it is one and unchangeable wherever we meet it. The work of Christ for all sinners who will receive Him, is commensurate with the wants of every sinner ; a work whose results are proffered freely to every sinner, and a work so perfect, that to those who receive Him, there is therefore now no condemnation, not a vestige of it ; so that the individual believer is free from all guilt, personally accepted before God, and owned as God's child.

There is the definiteness of this truth, so definite that if any one shall venture to say anything contrary to this, then in the language of the Apostle Paul, even though he were an angel from heaven, "let him be accursed." The truth being so definite, being one and the same always and in all circumstances of our condition, is such as can be easily apprehended.

*Direct Access to Jesus.*

The next element that I have referred to, is the directness of our access to Jesus, as He is represented to us in this definite truth of the Gospel. In order to the salvation of any individual man, now that the Saviour has accomplished His work, there is nothing necessary but simply his direct and personal approach, in his confidence and his affections, to the Lord Jesus Christ. There is no necessity of any intervention between him and Jesus. No sacraments are to be made to intervene. The church itself cannot thus be brought between them. The ministry has nothing whatsoever to do with this question, except to stand like a sign-board and point the inquirer to the Lord Jesus Christ. All that he has to do, is simply to go to Jesus directly and now. This directness of access to Christ is made known to us repeatedly in the New Testament. When the jailer, cried "What shall I do to be

saved?" the answer was, "*Believe on, \* \* and thou shalt be saved.*" Not simply "believe historically," but "*believe on.*" Rest upon Jesus, and repose on him, and you are saved. And it may be in a moment, it may be quick as a flash of God's own light. When the bitten Israelite, bitten by the fiery flying serpent of the wilderness, lifted his eye to the brazen serpent according to God's direction, the very look effected the cure; no sooner did the eye perceive it, than its remedial influence poured into his system. Now, precisely so it is, according to the very words of Jesus Himself, there is this directness of access to Him, and that is a part of the simplicity that is in Christ. If any man think that he cannot go straightly to Jesus, that he must have something to take along with him to recommend him to Jesus, that he must have a priesthood, a human priesthood to intervene between him and Jesus, that man is thinking in direct antagonism to the simplicity of the gospel.

*Authoritative Clearness of the Truth.*

Then the third element in this simplicity; that is, in Christ, is the authoritative clearness of the truth as it is in Jesus. It is not only truth clearly stated, but that clear statement is authoritative; there is no necessity of abstruse speculations; there is no complexity puzzling the intellect. It is true there is a philosophy, a divine philosophy, wrapt up in this whole plan of human redemption by the blood of the divine substitute—that philosophy no human eye, not even the acumen of Gabriel, can suffice to fathom; and we are not called upon to investigate that philosophy. But when the Gospel comes to me, or comes to you, it comes like an ambassador from the throne, it comes with its own credentials of authority; and when it speaks, it speaks in the name of its own dread sovereign, and it says to the sinner, "*Believe.*" That is the duty, that is the obligation placed upon the soul. It is not required to make metaphysical investigations. It goes to the laborer in his hut, or to the laborer in the field of toil; it goes to the philosopher in his seat of science and of literature; it finds men in different circumstances all over the world; in barbarism, in civilization, among the prosperous and among the unfortunate; but whenever it speaks, upon whatever occasion it lifts its voice, it is simply in the tone of divine authority; and so it hushes every doubt, puts to sleep every disturbing element of the heart, lays

the entire soul in simple repose upon the truth; and thus how simple this makes it all. If we were called upon to investigate abstrusely, why, then, there would lie no hope of our ever coming to the definite point of salvation. For, just look at the history of this thing of mental speculations. Can you meet two minds that will speculate just alike? Start them from the very same point, and they will travel together but a few inches before they begin to diverge, having no guide to follow, no clue to insure their arrival at the desired haven. Now, we need this authority; we need that God shall speak to us; we need to realize that it is God that speaks; and the gospel will be entertained by no heart that does not realize it. Now, put together these three things: The definiteness of the truth; the directness of our access to Him whom this truth presents to our view; and the authoritativeness of the truth in its clear statements. This is the simplicity that is in Christ. And whenever these three elements are held aloft, presented to the attention of the people and kept before their minds, there the Gospel is simply and faithfully preached.

*The Knowledge of the Simplicity in Christ the Great Want of the Human Heart.*

Now, the knowledge of this simplicity that is in Christ, is the great and urgent want of our times; because, first of all, it is the great and crying want of the human heart. Wherever that heart is found, in whatever associations, in whatever relations with the world, or with the trials and afflictions, or the prosperity of the world, the great want of the heart is the knowledge of this simplicity that is in Christ. And if it be the great want of the human heart, it is especially the crying want of our present time. Let me illustrate this to you if I can. We look abroad upon the face of the church and find a vast deal of activity—religious activity—a great deal of doing good. Contributions are asked for a variety of benevolent causes, and the appeals made for them are nobly met and answered. Again, there is the interest that prompts people to come to the house of God, week by week, and take part in the responsibilities of a particular parish, and to feel a personal interest in the clergy connected with these various parishes and churches.

And underneath all the religious activity we see about us, there is, of course, as its very foundation and support, the recognition



by the conscience of its responsibility to God, the feeling in the heart that God is to be worshipped, and that we must serve Him if we would please Him. And thus society may be said to be, in a certain sense of the expression, full of religious activity and interest. And yet, my brethren, is it not a fact, that if I ask you this question—and may I not take your answer to it as a specimen of the answer that would be given everywhere—“My dear sir, while you are thus active in these matters, is it true that you in your own heart are a happy Christian? Is it true that, in your secret self, you are feeling the joys of your Lord’s presence?” Would you not answer, “I cannot say that I am feeling it? I go to church, indeed, and I have an interest in the church. I love to go, but I am not happy; I am not satisfied; I have a want in spite of all religious service; in spite of all my love for the church, an aching want never as yet supplied. I feel it as I lie down upon my bed at night; I feel it when I attempt to mediate before God on my personal positions and relations with Him; I long, I yearn for a different state of soul; I am not happy. God’s love! Oh! if it did but burn within me and thrill all my heart with its heavenly power! But it does not.” Do I misrepresent you if I say, that in the vast majority of instances you would return this answer? And would I misrepresent the majority of Christians, if I should say that such would be the answer they would return? I think not. Having gone in and out for so many years among parishioners dear to me, having known such an infinite variety of character among them, I have this to say: that it has been only here and there that I have come in contact with one who is a clear, happy and rejoicing Christian. Oh! the light of the truth of Jesus, shining in the heart so as to fill that soul with the very sense of the preciousness of Jesus. And, brethren, what is the matter? Why is it so? Why should it be so? Certainly, if I have represented properly the Gospel of Christ in describing its simplicity, then God does not mean that it should be so; and when He sends the Gospel to you and me, He means it to come as the very joy of our hearts, and to fill our souls with its divine blessedness. Why is it, then, that such is the fact in regard to ourselves? Oh, do you not see? It is the crying want of your hearts, the crying want of the church in these times, to know the simplicity that is in Christ.

But, then, look at another feature of our times, the great mental

activity, the activity especially in the direction of speculations. Why, you cannot go into a book-store for a moment without seeing some book just issued from the press that gives evidence of this. Everybody is intellectually on the alert as to the question, what is truth? And though the cry comes from millions of souls, yet the answer is never given to these speculations; they go on asking and speculating and never finding rest. What do they want? Why it is just this, the *authoritativeness* of the Gospel; this authoritative clearness: God speaking, man submitting; and where that is felt, the whole matter is plain. It is, then, the great crying want of our times, to know the simplicity that is in Christ.

---

#### THROUGH CHRIST.

BY REV. H. H. W. HIBSHMAN.

*"I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me."—Phil. 4: 13.*

THE duties incumbent on Christians are various; and to discharge them aright, requires the influence of the Divine Spirit. No one can attain to the standard of the Gospel by the force of his own will and determined resolutions, nor by the strictest improvement of the means of grace, without reliance upon the Spirit of God. All power to discharge Christian duties, whether purely Christian or moral, comes from Jesus, the Lord's Christ. To do the things required to obtain the "rest that remaineth to the people of God," we must look to Jesus as the strength.

It matters not in what circumstances we are placed, whether frowned upon by adversity, or smiled upon by prosperity, whether in health or in sickness, whether in a state of poverty or in a state of plenty, we can by, in and through Christ, do all things well pleasing to God. There is no condition into which we can be placed that we cannot say, positively: "I can do all things through Christ." The true Christian carries the *altar* with him in his heart, upon which he can offer, in secret, the acceptable incense of prayer and praise to his heavenly Father, whether in the house or in the field, in the church or in the dungeon, by night or by day. He can come boldly to the throne of grace and mercy, to obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of

need, when no eye sees him and no ear hears him but God's eye and ear. Heb. 4: 16.

No wonder Paul wrote so confidently and encouragingly, as he was chained to one of the Prætorian soldiers in Rome, a prisoner for the cause of Jesus his Lord: "I can do all things through Christ, who strengtheneth me." Christ is everywhere, and those who love Him can feel His presence, for He giveth His Spirit to every one who sincerely asks Him for the same.

We purpose to show that our sufficiency to discharge our duties aright before God, comes from Christ.

Professors of religion are called upon to do all things which God our Mighty Saviour demands. The law of God is still the rule by which to regulate our conduct before heaven. Man must render obedience to it. Without this he is not saved. No faith is genuine, justifying or saving faith, that is not productive of good works. It is a delusion—antinomian—that a man may have true faith in Jesus, who dishonors God and the blood bought church, and disgraces himself daily by wicked words and acts. Those who are created in Christ Jesus unto good works, walk in them. A man who possesses fully the power of faith in Jesus, is "zealous of good works;" he "lives soberly, righteously and godly in this present world"—he overcomes evil, for the grace of God is sufficient for him: "*My grace is sufficient* for thee," says the Lord to every believer. 2 Cor. 12: 9.

Let all know that our Reformed church ever taught and does teach to-day, that to inherit eternal life through the blood and death of Jesus, by faith and by faith only, we must do all things demanded of us in the gospel. DO ALL THINGS.

Bring forth works meet for repentance. Do such good works as are according to the will of God. It is by such good works that we have the assurance of being really and actually ingrafted into Christ Jesus and receive all His saving benefits by true faith.

Good works performed according to the Law of God, and with an eye single to the glory of God, testify to us that we possess true faith—that we will be saved with everlasting salvation by Jesus—are righteous in the eyes of God for the sake of Jesus—are children of God, heirs, joint-heirs with the Son of God to inherit the joys and felicities of heaven.

It is by good works we let our light shine before the world. In a word: the person who is destitute of good works, that are



acceptable and pleasing to God, is a base deceiver in the house of the Lord; his professed faith a dead faith, certain to be visited with the punishment he deserves and is not in Christ Jesus; just as he who grounds his hope for salvation on the whole or part of his good works, is a white-washed hypocrite, denying in verity Jesus as the *only* Deliverer and Saviour.

There is, however, true, saving faith, where some of the fruit peculiar to saving faith is wanting, or is very imperfect. Some bring a hundred-fold, some sixty and some thirty. All trees in an orchard are not alike fruitful and alike valuable. And trees do not always bring forth the fruit in perfection. So is it among true believers in Christ. Some bring forth much fruit, others very little—some run fast towards heaven, others drag slowly up the hill. He who hath true faith will engage in good works of piety, mercy and charity. "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit." Matt. 7: 17. "Being filled with the fruits of righteousness which are by Jesus Christ, unto the praise and glory of God," Phil. 1: 11. "Faith without works is dead." James 2: 17. Where true faith, implicit confidence and trust in Jesus is, good works are inseparable from it; where grace abounds, faith abounds; and where faith abounds, good works abound also. "By grace are ye saved, through faith, which is the gift of God." Phil. 2. Grace is God's moulding, revivifying, transforming power, to change the vile heart of the sinner, to give new dispositions to the soul, to subdue his will, to regulate his depraved passions, to bring "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10: 5. It is a leaven that leaveneth the whole lump. Matt. 13: 33. It is an unspeakable gift given by God to the unworthy and undeserving, through mercy and love in Christ. It came by Jesus Christ. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." John 1: 17. It enables a man to say, "I can do all things." How? By himself? No, but *through Christ*, God's depository of grace—the "Golden Pipe" through which God conveys the same to the soul of man.

The glorified Jesus at the right hand of God the Father became the Mediator by whom the Holy Ghost was sent into the world to abide with the christian church; that is the true children of God to make sinners "willing and ready" to live lives of obedience unto God—to do all things commanded for the honor and glory of God. But let us be more explicit. As already indicated, the

law of God is the rule by which we are to walk. It declares what man must do. Our hearts must be governed by its spirit, and our conduct conform to its requirements. What is it? Our Lord Jesus gives us a compend of the whole law in his reply to the young lawyer who asked, "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus answered: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. 22: 36-40.

The first duty of every man is to love God and obey Him perfectly. It must be supreme love, such love as God is worthy of and which He created us capable to render. He made us to love Him heartily. If we love Him we obey Him. Obedience to His holy will is the evidence of the perfection of the love demanded; we are to obey the law unceasingly, in thought, in word, in deed. Every minute. The second duty of every man is, to love his fellow-man. This is also made obligatory. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Every man is bound by the requirements of this law "to love his fellow-man as truly as he loves himself, and to consult his interests, his comfort and his welfare as truly as he consults his own."

---

THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

CHAPTER XVII.

*Of the Catholic and Holy Church; and of the One only Head of the Same.*

SINCE from the beginning God desired to save men, and to let them come to the knowledge of the truth, (1 Tim. 2: 4), there must always have been, there must be now, and there must exist unto the end of the world, a church; that is, a congregation of believers, called and gathered out of the world, a communion of saints, namely, of such who by the Word and the Holy Spirit truly know and rightly worship the true God in Christ the Saviour, and who, by faith, partake of all benefits which are freely offered

through Christ. They are all citizens of one city, living under one Lord, under the same laws, in the same fellowship of all benefits; for so they are called "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." Eph. 2 : 19.

Believers upon the earth, the Apostle calls "Saints," sanctified by the blood of the Son of God. 1 Cor. 6 : 1. It is of these that that article of the Creed is to be understood : "I believe one Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints."

Since there is always but "one God, and one Mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ," (1 Tim. 2 : 5), one Shepherd of the whole flock, one Head of the body, one Spirit, one Salvation, one Faith, one Testament and Covenant, it follows necessarily that there is but *one Church* which, on that account, we call the Catholic church, because it is universal and spread through all parts of the world, and reaches to all times, and is not bound to any place or time. Hence, we condemn the Donatists, who confined the church to some *corner* of Africa; nor do we agree with the Roman clergy, who proclaim the Roman church to be the only Catholic church.

It is true, the church is separated into different parts or forms, but it is not rent or divided; but this more on account of the differences among the members of the same. For some of these compose the Militant, and others, the Triumphant church. The former is still upon earth, and contending with the flesh, the world, and the prince of the world, the devil; with sin and with death. The latter, already crowned with the palm, is triumphant in heaven, having overcome all those things, and rejoices before the Lord. Nevertheless, the two have a fellowship between them.

The church Militant, also, has from the commencement upon the earth, many particular churches, which are nevertheless counted in with the unity of the Church Catholic. It was differently ordered before the Lord, under the Patriarchs; differently again under Moses, through the law; differently by Christ, through the Gospel. Usually, there are named two peoples, namely, the Israelites and the Gentiles, or those who were gathered from the Jews and Gentiles into the church. So also there are two Testaments, the Old and the New. But of all these peoples there arose and is only one Communion, one Salvation in one Messiah, in whom they are all joined under one head, as members of one body, and partake of the same spiritual meat and drink.



But hereby we recognize still that there were diverse times, diverse signs, (*Symbola*) of Christ promised, and Christ exhibited, and that after the ceremonies were abolished, a clearer light shines upon us, and richer gifts are promised, and a fuller liberty.

This holy church of God is called, "Temple of the Living God," (2 Cor. 6 : 16), built of living and spiritual stones, (1 Pet. 2 : 5), "founded upon a rock," (Matt. 16 : 18), "that cannot be moved," (Heb. 12 : 28), upon a foundation besides which none can be laid. 1 Cor. 3 : 11. Therefore it is also called, "the Ground and Pillar of the Truth." (1 Tim. 3 : 15.

In so far as it stands upon the rock, Christ, and upon the foundations of the Prophets and Apostles, it does not err. But it is not to be wondered that it does err when it forsakes Him who alone is the truth.

The church is also called "a Virgin," (2 Cor. 11 : 12), and the Spouse of Christ; and in truth, his only and beloved, (Cant. 4 : 8; 5 : 16.) The church is also called a flock of sheep under one Shepherd, Christ. Ezek. 34 : 22, 24, 31; John 10 : 1. And finally, also the body of Christ, (Col. 1 : 24), because believers are living members of the one Head, namely, Christ.

That which in the body has the preëminence, from whence the life in the body flows, whose spirit governs all members, from whence growth and increase comes—that is the head. And there can be but one head suitable to the body. *Therefore the church cannot have any other head besides Christ.*

For as the church is a spiritual body, so it must have a spiritual head corresponding to it. The church cannot be governed by any other spirit, but the Spirit of Christ. Col. 1 : 18; Eph. 5 : 23. Christ is "the Head of the church, which is His body, &c.," says Paul. Eph. 1 : 22, 23; Eph. 4 : 15, 16.

Hence, we do not accept the doctrine of the Romish clergy, which makes its Romish High-priest to be the general pastor of the Militant church upon earth; yea, the supreme head and real substitute of Christ, who, as they say, has fullness of power and sovereign authority. But we teach, that Christ is the Lord, and remains the *only* Shepherd of all, the High-priest before God the Father; and that He himself exercises in the church all priestly and pastoral offices, even to the end of this world. Nor does He stand in need of a substitute, because He is not absent. Christ is present in His church, and is its life-giving head. He Himself

forbade most earnestly to the Apostles and their successors all primacy and dominion in the church. Mark 10:42; Matt. 20:26; 28:20. All they who contradict and strive against this manifest truth, must be reckoned, (who does not see this?) among the number of those of whom the Apostles of Christ prophesied, as in 2 Pet. 2:1; 2 Cor. 11:3; Acts 20:29; 2 Thes. 2:3.

Now, when we put away the Romish head, we do not bring any disorder or confusion into the church, for we teach that the government of the church, as it comes from the Apostles, is sufficient to keep the church in due order; which, from the beginning, while it was without such a Romish supreme head, as is now pretended, it preserves order in the church, was by no means without order and full of confusion. The Romish head, it is true, preserves its lordship, and the corruption introduced into the church; but it also stands in the way, opposes and divides, as far as it can, a right reformation of the church.

They cast in our teeth, that in the churches there are all sorts of strifes and dissensions since they severed themselves from the Romish church—consequently they cannot be true churches. As though in the Romish church there had never been sects, no divisions and contention; and that in matters of religion, are carried on not only in schools, but in the pulpits, and in the midst of the people! We acknowledge as true what the Apostle says: (1 Cor. 14:33; 3:3, 4,) “Whereas, there is among you envying, and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal!” Yet it cannot be denied that God was with the Apostolic church, and that it was the true church, although strifes and dissensions came forward in it.

Paul chides the Apostle Peter, (Gal. 2:11); and Barnabas fell at variance with Paul. Acts 15:39. Great contention arose in the church of Antioch between them that preached one and the same Christ, as Luke records, Acts 15:39. There have at all times been earnest contentions in the church; and the most celebrated church teachers differed in opinions in weighty matters, without that on account of these dissensions the church ceased to be what it was. For it is God’s pleasure to use the dissensions that arise in the church to the glory of His name, and to the development of the truth; and to the end, also, “that they which are approved, may be made manifest among you.” 1 Cor. 11:19.

And as we acknowledge no other head of the church than

Christ, so we also acknowledge no church as the *true one*, which wants herself to be the true one. But we teach, *that* to be the true church indeed, in which are found the marks and characteristics of the true church. First of all, the right and pure preaching of the Word, as it has been transmitted to us in the books of the Prophets and Apostles, all of which lead us to Christ, who in the Gospel says: "My sheep hear My voice, &c." John 10: 27, 28; John 10: 5. They who are in such a church have one faith, one spirit, and therefore they worship one God; Him only do they worship in spirit and in truth; upon Him they call with all their hearts, and with all their powers through one, the Mediator and Advocate, Christ. Out of Christ and faith they seek no righteousness and no life. Because they acknowledge Christ alone as the head and rock of the church, and being grounded in Him, daily renewing repentance, therefore they with patience bear the cross laid upon them. And united with all members of Christ in sincere love, they show themselves to be the disciples of Christ by continuing in the bond of peace and of holy unity. They partake of the sacraments instituted of the Lord, and delivered to us by the Apostles, and do not use them in any other manner than they were given by the Lord. For every one knows the saying of the Apostle: "*I received from the Lord* that which I also delivered unto you, &c." 1 Cor. 11: 23.

We condemn all such churches as strangers from the true church of Christ, who are not such as they ought to be, (according to the above marks), however much they may boast of the succession of the bishops, of unity and of antiquity. The Apostles command us to flee from idolatry and Babylon, (1 Cor. 11: 14; 1 John 5: 21), and to have no fellowship with her if we do not mean to be partakers with her of God's judgments. Rev. 18: 4; 2 Cor. 6: 17. But the communion with the true church of Christ we esteem so highly, that we say: None can live before God who do not stand in communion with her, but separate themselves from her.

For, as out of Noah's ark there was no deliverance, when the world perished in the flood, so we also believe, that out of Christ, who in the church gives Himself to be enjoyed of the elect, there can be no sure salvation; and therefore all who wish to be saved, must in no wise separate themselves from the church of Christ.



But with the above mentioned marks, we do not confine the church within such narrow limits that we regard as outside of the church all those who do not partake of the sacraments (refraining therefrom unwillingly, without contempt of the same, being rather restrained by unavoidable obstacles); or those in whom faith does sometimes fail without entirely decaying or ceasing; or such in whom weaknesses, or errors of infirmity may be found. For we know that God has some friends yet outside of the congregation of Israel. We know what befel the people of God in the Babylonian captivity, where they were deprived of their sacrifices for seventy years. We know what befel Peter, who denied his Master, and what yet daily befalls the elect of God, that they go astray and are weak. We know, finally, how it was in the age of the Apostles in the churches of the Galatians and Corinthians, in which the Apostle rebukes many and heinous vices, and yet he calls them the holy churches of Christ. 1 Cor. 1 : 2 ; Gal. 1 : 2. Yea, it sometimes takes place, that God out of a just judgment suffers the truth of His word, and the Catholic faith and the right worship, to become obscured and defaced, so that the church seems to be almost obliterated; as, for example, in the days of Elias, and at other times. 1 Kings 19 : 10, 14. And yet God still had in the world, and in these times of darkness, His true worshipers, and not a few, but seven thousand, and more. 1 Kings 19 : 18 ; Rev. 7 . 4. The Apostle also says, (2 Tim. 2 : 19), "Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His."

Hence, the church may also be called an invisible one, not that the men of which it is composed are invisible, but because it is hidden from our eyes, known to God alone, and withdrawn from human judgment. And again, not all who are numbered in the church, are holy and true members of the same. For there are many hypocrites, who outwardly hear the Word of God, and openly receive the sacraments, who also *seem* to call upon God through Christ alone, and to confess Christ as their only righteousness, to honor God, to do works of love, and for awhile endure with patience in tribulations; but inwardly they are destitute of the true illumination of the spirit, of sincerity of faith and the heart, and of perseverance unto the end. Whoever such may be, they will in the end become manifest. 1 John 2 : 19. Yet these men, while they hypocritically pretend to be pious, are numbered in

the (outward) church, although they are not of it. Just as the traitors in a commonwealth are counted among the citizens before they are discovered ; and as cheat and tares are found in wheat, or as wens and swellings are found in the healthy body, which, instead of real members, are much rather diseases and deformities. Hence the church of God is well compared to a net, which brings up all sorts of fishes, or to a field in which both tares and wheat are found. Matt. 13 : 47, 24. Hence we must be specially careful not to judge before the time, nor to exclude and cast away or cut off those whom the Lord will not have excluded and cast away, or whom we cannot separate without injury to the church. But, on the other hand, we must also watch, lest whilst the godly slumber, the godless increase and injure the church.

We further teach, that care must be taken in respect to that wherein specially the truth and unity of the church consists, that we do not rashly occasion and nourish separation in the church. This does not consist in the ceremonies and outward customs, but rather in the truth and unity of the Catholic faith. The Catholic faith is not taught us through human laws, but is given in the holy Scriptures, whose brief summary is the Apostle's Creed. We read also, in the ancient writers, of manifold diversities in the ceremonies, and that these were so free that no one ever thought that the church unity was thereby broken. Hence we say, that the true church unity consists in doctrines of faith, and the true and uniform preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and *those* rites which have been expressly instituted *of the Lord himself*. And here we very earnestly urge that saying of the Apostle, (Phil. 3 : 15, 16,) "Let us, therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded ; and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule ; let us mind the same thing."

---

#### THE LOWER STONE CHURCH.

THE progress of the work was doomed to great obstruction, and was accomplished only after long days of weary waiting. The unhappy and mistaken spirit of rivalry and contention that was cherished without toward another denomination, it became appar-

ent now existed at home, between prominent members of the church. However, the corner-stone of the new edifice was laid in 1795. Rev. Andrew Loretz, of Lincoln, at this time, had succeeded Suther, and if not the pastor, at least an occasional supply of this congregation. Col. Geo. Henry Berger and Jacob Fisher were the elders. (This is the remote ancestral of Dr. Fisher of the *Messenger*, and whose descendants the Dr. visited on his recent visits into North Carolina.) These two elders were most active in the proposed erection of a new church. Berger, who was a man of large wealth for those days, took some exception to the contents of a manuscript document placed by the pastor among the contents of the corner-stone. This paper, Berger alleged, gave too much credit and prominence to Jacob Fisher, his colleague in the eldership, who was a poor man but very efficient and liberal in all the affairs of the church. On account of this supposed slight, Berger refused to aid in the erection of the walls, but under the stimulating presence and activity of Fisher the work was completed. Berger seeing he was about to have no part or lot in the good and great work, now proposed that if Fisher would relinquish it, he "would show them what he would do." As the money of Berger was needed, Fisher assented to the proposition. Now, however, to the amazement of every one, Berger demanded as the condition of the exhibition of his liberality, that the walls should be taken down; that the offensive document be removed from the corner-stone; that the offending pastor, Loretz, be dismissed. This was more than those sturdy backwoodsmen would do to relieve any man's wounded pride, or to secure his money, and the conditions were peremptorily refused, so the world and that church never saw *what* "he would do." But all this, of course, delayed the completion of the church, and only in sixteen years after the corner-stone was laid, was the house finished. This was soon after the Revolution of 1776 was ended; and the people being poor, and also divided, they resorted to a lottery to raise funds to complete their work. In those days, this was a common mode often resorted to for the purpose, and few questioned its propriety. In November, 1811, this sanctuary was dedicated to the worship of Almighty God. The services for that occasion were performed by the pastor, Loretz, and Rev. Dr. Robinson, then, and for many years after, the beloved pastor of the Presbyterian church at Poplar Tent.



The material of the walls is the rough and unpolished stone of that region. \*Some granite, others sandstone or slate. The workmanship is rude, but the walls are massive and defy alike the wear of time or the shocks of the storm. The dimensions of the house are fifty by forty feet. It is very high, but without a spire. In that day and region, esteemed an elegant style. The floor is flagged with slate, except the span in front of the pulpit. There are galleries on three sides. The pulpit is one of those remarkable structures now rapidly passing from the memory of this generation. A small, circular tub-shaped affair, placed on an upright shaft, barely large enough for an ordinary sized man to stand in uncomfortably. It measures thirteen feet nine inches from the floor to the top of the desk, and is surmounted by a sounding-board that ever seems ready to fall upon and crush the hapless preacher beneath. To look down from that height may well appal one whose nerves were weak, and whose head is easily dizzied ; but those men of rigid nerves who built it, never thought that the place where Loretz thundered forth the terrors of God's law would ever be filled by men whose heads were light, or their nerves delicate. In the south wall there is inserted a slate, on which is engraved a dial, and over it are the words, "Im yohr Christi, 1795." Under it, "Mit Gottes Hülff." Over each of the three doors by which entrance is had to this sanctuary, is inserted a slate also with an inscription, but neither the thought or the style demand their preservation.

We cannot now learn who succeeded Loretz in the pastorate. Father Boger was for many years, before 1830, the gentle, patient and laborious shepherd of this flock ; and in this year, or early in 1831, was succeeded by the now sainted D. B. Lerch, who, among this people of his early ministry, finished his course. His dust rests, in the adjoining graveyard immediately in the rear of the pulpit, from which he had so often preached lovingly Jesus to this congregation. The people of his charge placed a neat slab over his grave ; but we noticed as we stood by it to read the inscription, that it needs the care of some loving hand, or some one who reveres his memory for Jesus' sake. The wall on which the slab rests was giving way, and sadly out of repair. Doubtless, those of that congregation who remember this beloved disciple, will heed this gentle intimation of a neglected duty, and ere we shall again visit that sacred resting-place, make the repairs, so that

we may reverence the past. Rev. Lerch was succeeded in the pastorate by Rev. John Lantz, now of Taneytown, Maryland. In 1852 Rev. T. Butler assumed the pastorate of the Lower Stone church, and for a short time had associated with him Rev. Gilbert Lane, now of Minaville, New York.

Rev. Mr. Butler in 1868 removed to Illinois, where he has since finished his earthly labor, and was succeeded at the Lower Stone church by Rev. J. C. Denny, who is the present pastor.

As the writer was about to pass from the graveyard into the street, after a visit to that quiet God's acre, he was attracted near the gate by an humble stone, which told that there rested all that was mortal of Colonel George Henry Berger, the offended elder. This sufficed to suggest a look for the grave of his unentitled rival, Jacob Fisher. It was soon found, and only a few feet distant. There they both lie, peaceful sleepers, almost forgotten. No rivalry now. It is to be hoped there was no bitterness in their hearts when they passed from earth—the grace of God had overcome it all—and that on the glorious morn when they shall rise and meet face to face in the likeness of Christ, they will embrace lovingly.

G. W. W.

---

#### THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EASTERN SYNOD.

As stated in our Monthly Summary for March, a special meeting of the above named Synod was held in Lancaster, Pa., on Wednesday and Thursday, February 19th and 20th, and the particular objects of the meeting have been given. Efforts were made by published articles on those objects, to secure a large and interested attendance. Nevertheless, the attendance proved to be very small. Only *forty-seven* of the *one hundred and two* delegates entitled to a seat, were present, and six of these were from the city of Lancaster. But *sixteen elders* answered to their names, and of these, *two* were from the same congregation in Lancaster, (Dr. A. H. Kremer's), and *one* from the College congregation. Only *four* were there to represent Philadelphia Classis, two ministers and two elders, and those *four all secundi*; and,

### *The Special Meeting of the Eastern Synod. 181*

with perhaps one exception, not representatives of the strongly ruling sentiment and position of the Classis.

Facts like these are significant. What all they may mean, it might not be easy or expedient to suggest. They could not fail to impress the brethren at Lancaster, who had private as well as official reasons for desiring a full and enthusiastic response to the call for the meeting. That only a *minority of the whole number of delegates* should answer to the summons, must have been a disheartening effect upon the few who may be supposed to have felt the liveliest interest in the main purpose of the meeting, viz: *Rallying their full strength to the defence and furtherance of the interests represented by the Institutions at Lancaster.*

Due effort had been made, as already intimated, to stir up the zeal of the delegates in regard to the matter. Probably private appeals were added to those of a more public character, in order to secure a large turn out. The great importance of a consolidation of the friends of the new theology in the east, into unified cōoperation, was deeply felt and eloquently plead, and somewhat boldly, too, even so as to give the plea and its purpose a strong partisan aspect. It really may have seemed to some to look like the rallying of a party, for the purpose of counteracting and neutralizing the effect of the action of the General Synod at Cincinnati.

For every one acquainted with existing affairs, would notice immediately such points as these :

1. The calling of the meeting seemed to be sudden, and generally unexpected.
2. It was issued remarkably soon after the General Synod.
3. It was issued whilst a series of assaults were being published upon some acts of the General Synod ; assaults which painfully betrayed bitter dissatisfaction with those acts.
4. The call was not issued, of course, without some previous consultation among some of those most anxious in the case.
5. The *items* included in the call, were not such as in ordinary circumstances would require so much haste.

All these things pretty clearly indicate that those best acquainted with the situation, must have been moved by strong considerations of one kind or another, to have the special meeting called so early, to have it fixed for the 19th and 20th of February, and to have it



convened in Lancaster, Pa., the place on whose kind hospitality the General Synod had declined to impose at its next triennial sessions. And just as clearly do these things suggest, that it must have been thought exceedingly desirable to enlist a full attendance.

Why the delegates turned out in such small numbers, it might be difficult to surmise. Neither the season, roads, expense, or place (which, by the way, was very central), serve to account for it. All that can be said is, that but very few went, very few, indeed, considering all the circumstances.

It is true, quite a list of advisory members is reported, including twenty-seven ministers; that is, within three as many of the number of ministerial delegates. But whilst the presence of these would give the appearance of a large attendance, they added nothing to the real strength of the Synod or the authority of its action. And it seems strange that there was no one present to represent the Pittsburg Synod, and comparatively few to represent the new Synod about to be formed of the Classis west of the Susquehanna, including Zion's and Mercersburg, and the others lying south of those.

It is easy to suppose that the small number of delegates who did attend, must have felt somewhat disheartened, if not embarrassed, by this fact. This might be the case, particularly with those most concerned for the great purpose of the meeting. There were, indeed, enough present to form a constitutional quorum for the transaction of the proposed business. But whatever was done, could not have been as enthusiastically done, and could not be expected to carry as much weight as if, instead of but forty-seven delegates, there had been at least eighty or ninety present.

As to the doings of the Synod, it appears from reports published, that the programme of business laid out for it was adopted with but slight, if any modifications. And there seem to have been but very little discussion on the points proposed. Some of them, in a constitutional point of view, were of a very grave nature. The *plan of union* of the Eastern Synods in the support and management of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., had been shown to be open to serious objections on constitutional grounds, even by those avowing the warmest sympathy for the Lancaster school. But the objections must have been summarily set aside, for they do not seem to have at all hindered a speedy adoption of the plan. Even Dr. S. R. Fisher appears, in this instance, to have succumbed to

*The Special Meeting of the Eastern Synod.* 183

the pressure in its favor. The zeal for maintaining the integrity of the Constitution which he has so often displayed, and which flamed out so brilliantly at Martinsburg last October, seems to have fallen with the temperature of the cold winter, far below zero. This is the most remarkable, because the case at Martinsburg involved points which, to say the least, were doubtful; whilst the proposed and adopted, (that is, as far as the single Eastern Synod could adopt it,) plan of union, has been regarded, and we think proven, by some favoring its purpose, to be a flagrant violation of the Constitution.

If Dr. Fisher and others can justify *an Eastern Synod* in doing violence to the Constitution, some persons may not be able to understand how such Synod could consistently denounce and condemn an individual member for an alleged violation in a dubious case? But circumstances often alter cases, and consistency is not one of the jewels much prized by Mittelmas, for personal wear.

It deserves to be noted, however, that whatever the nature and character of the action of the special Synod may be, and little time as was taken for deliberation in the case by the Synod as such, the great object, or purposes of the meeting, appear to have been previously much thought of and very carefully weighed by those at whose particular request the special meeting was called. They did not act without ample premeditation, and probably, also, not without some antecedent consultation among themselves. No doubt they believed that strong reasons existed for holding such an extraordinary session just at this time, and rendered it indispensable. What those reasons were, was partly announced or indicated beforehand. Those thus announced or indicated plainly, imply others which would naturally have their influence. Taking both together, they appear to have been the following:

1. By the formation of new district Synods, on the territory previously covered, for the most part, by the Eastern Synod as a whole, the extent, strength and influence of that Synod are greatly reduced. In fact, it becomes a very small body, of comparatively limited extent. Heretofore it reached from the Atlantic on the east into the Alleghenies on the west, and took in the entire continent from north to south within those lines. Now its geographical limits are cut down very considerably. On the west it reaches only to the Susquehanna, below the northern boundary of Zion Classis, and on the south its jurisdiction ends with Mason's and

Dixon's (Maryland) line. By the formation of the Pittsburg Synod it lost the three Classes of Clarion, St. Paul, and Western New York, with a population of about 6000 communicant members. By the Constitution of the new Synod about to be organized, it will lose the five Classes already named, and a population of about 30,000 communicant members. Thus, by this arrangement alone, besides being so largely reduced in territory, the diminution in membership may be safely set down at 40,000.

But this is not all. There will be a further subtraction from its real extent and strength, by the organization of the German Synod, which has been authorized and provided for. That will take at least 10,000 more from its membership, swelling the entire loss to 50,000. This will leave it with a membership of but 40,000, instead of the 90,000 (in round numbers) heretofore under the jurisdiction of the Synod, or scarcely one-fourth of the membership of the entire church.

All this, of course, must be attended and followed by important results, affecting largely the financial interest, and more especially the moral power and influence of the Synod. It is not to be supposed that such results were not foreseen and considered, in part, at least. But we doubt it was calculated that certain advantage to be gained would overbalance the effect of those losses. And yet when matters came to their issue, and the facts involved in the formation of the new Synods were about to be fully realized, the supposed advantages upon which those most deeply interested may have calculated, may have seemed to be over-estimated. At any rate those more immediately affected by those facts, and their probable effect, appear to have become alarmed, and to have viewed the situation in a new light. Hence the great necessity of some prompt action to meet the exigencies of the case in this respect, and, if possible, keep the Eastern forces virtually united, even though formally separated. Measures appeared to be required in order that certain influences in the old Eastern Synod might still retain predominant control.

2. This reduction of the extent and strength of the old Eastern Synod would be naturally regarded as affecting, and perhaps seriously, the interests of the Institutions of said Synod, and in many ways. Here then was a peril threatening, which must if possible be averted. The best means of averting this, appeared to be to



### *The Special Meeting of the Eastern Synod. 185*

secure a compact of consolidation in this respect, making Lancaster the central interest of all the Eastern Synods.

Accordingly, a so-called plan of union, in educational and mission work, was adopted. Boards of Trustees and visitors, made up of an equal number of members of the three Synods, are to be created. These Boards are to have the same authority over the Theological Seminary, at Lancaster, now exercised by the Eastern Synod's Boards, only the members are to be responsible to the respective Synods which elected them.

Home missions are to be conducted on a similar plan.

The scheme is a very strange and complicated one, and it is not surprising that some more considerate persons should have serious doubts about both its constitutionality and feasibility. Its adoption at Lancaster, however, gave the thing the appearance of a *union measure, and under this aspect it may have been expected to serve some end or ends not specially named.*

Of course the plan has not been finally adopted. Before this can be done, the other two Synods concerned must give their assent to it, and accept it; and, above all, it must receive the approval of the General Synod.

Altogether, therefore, the special Synod at Lancaster cannot be thought to have accomplished much as far as the published items of business for which it was convened are concerned, unless, indeed, its action, in a constitutional view, may have prepared work for future adjudication. Doubtless, the gathering afforded a pleasant opportunity for social interviews, for exchanging sentiments on other matters, and for stimulating each other to increased zeal in the work nearest their hearts.

Of the very interesting event connected with the meeting, the reader will find some account in another article.

---

THE London Missionary Society proposes to establish a mission in the great island of New Guinea, which is inhabited by tribes of savage, treacherous and blood-thirsty people. The undertaking is difficult and dangerous, but a number of missionaries have been found who are willing to enter the field. Their work will be confined at present to places along the coast; and to facilitate their movements, a missionary steamer is to be provided by the generosity of Miss Baxter, of Dundee.

## THE CHURCH MISREPRESENTED.

RECENTLY our friend and brother, F. K. L., of Pittsburg, directed public attention to what he considers a *wrong* in the *ratio of representation in the General Synod*. He thinks that under the present rule of the Constitution, the *East* with its large congregations and Classes suffers a great disadvantage in comparison with the West. This he endeavors to illustrate by figures, which seem to show that a membership of 61,000 in the East has no more delegates (36), than a membership of but 21,000, in the West. This is considered *unequal*, and calling for a remedy. What remedy may be devised, is acknowledged to be a difficult matter to decide. As an approximation to one, he recommends the *division of some of the larger Eastern Classes into two or more*, and concludes, in significant Latin, with *Verbum Sat!* (Sap.), which, of course, may mean several things.

F. K. L. has done well in calling attention to this matter. It is one of vital importance and deserves careful investigation, particularly at this time. Our present delegate system is clearly at fault somewhere. Whether the chief wrong lies where Brother L. puts it, remains to be seen. But no one can question or deny, that it involves what he calls "*unequal representation*." He might have gone further and declared, that as matters are mostly managed in electing delegates, not only to the General Synod, but to the district Synods, the church is greatly and grievously *misrepresented*. And no portion or section of the church suffers more wrong from this source than those "huge charges and Classes in the East," in which brother L.'s early associations led him to feel so lively an interest. This will probably appear more fully in the sequel of our article.

On another point, brother L. must be admitted to have taken the only true and right position for a member and minister of the Reformed church. *He assumes that the people are the church*, and so the first proper source of authority and power in the church as a visible, earthly organization. This is a fundamental truth which had been almost smothered under the rubbish, the new-order high-churchism. We most heartily thank the brother for dragging it forth again, and making the light of it shine through the dusky columns of the paper containing his article. Not the *ministers*, as Romish

priests, as the church *governing*, over against the *laity* or general membership, as the church *subject* to such priestly dominion constitute the source of authority and power in the church; but the *whole membership*, ministers and people, as the common spiritual priesthood, and as standing in this view on the same broad level. This is an excellent old Apostolic Reformed truth, and brother L. merits a vote of thanks from the whole church for so boldly asserting it, especially at this time. In the visible earthly church, as actually existing, power comes not from above; that is, as it is often erroneously expressed, from the ministry *down*, but from the *people*, who are the only church known to the New Testament, *out* (not *up*) to those *delegated by them* to exercise that power, representatively.

This is no new doctrine; it is old as the Reformed church; nay, as the Apostolic, primitive church. The church, "the body of Christ," in the true sense, receives its power or powers, indeed, from above, from the exalted head. But ministers, in their formally official capacity, and Synods, receive theirs through and from the people, that is the church. This has been the universal faith of the Evangelical church, never denied by any but hierarchists, or those who are such in reality, though under disguise.

Starting from this sound principle, L. further assumes that *all fair and just representation of the church* requires, that in delegated bodies, like Synods, *the true sentiment of the large mass of the people should rule*. That is, Synods should truly and honestly represent the will of the majority in the whole church; and especially should be a true exponent, in all their acts, of the mind of the great mass of the membership of the church. This is so evidently right and equitable, so clearly the only way of securing true and fair results, that none but those swayed by Romish sacerdotalism would think of denying it.

To make the case more plain, however, let a few illustrations be given.

Suppose, for instance, a half dozen ministers, say at Mercersburg or Lancaster, should from one cause or other become dissatisfied with the established doctrines and mode of worship of the Reformed church. Suppose further, that enjoying certain advantages of position and influence, they should succeed in getting a considerable number of ministers in the church to adopt their views. Then again suppose, that, by whatever steps, they



should get up a *new order of worship* on principles and a plan materially at variance with any thing heretofore known in the Reformed church, and involving an entire revolution in the life and character of the church, in the fundamental doctrines and constitution of the church.

Now, according to brother L., (and we heartily agree with him), it would be most flagrantly unjust to attempt to foist such radical changes upon the church, without giving the church, as a whole, the fullest and fairest opportunity of declaring its mind upon the matter. And, further, he thinks (and in this, too, we believe he is unquestionably right), that any ratio or system or practice of representation, which does not give the mass of the people—"the huge charges in the east," &c.—ample opportunity of asserting its sentiments and wishes, is *unequal*. He holds, virtually, therefore, that any measure of the sort supposed, which might be carried in any other way, would inflict a grievous wrong upon the people. *In all this he is most indubitably right.*

So likewise is he right and reasonable in the practical exhibit given, in figures, of the wrong complained of, and in his expressions of painful regret that such a great wrong should be inflicted. Thus, for instance, he shows that six Eastern Classes (Eastern Pennsylvania, Lebanon, Goshenhoppen, Zion's, Eastern Susquehanna, and Virginia), should properly have 104 delegates instead of 36.

Then he adds: "We frankly confess that we regret to see this state of things. It does wrong to one section of the church, and that the oldest, most numerous, and wealthy. It measurably smothers its voice, and lames its arm; it weakens its power for good, and destroys its feeling of equality. Besides, special temptations are offered for friction, and the occasion will not likely be wanting." To remedy this evil, he proposes, as above stated, a division of some of the larger eastern Classes, by which they would gain a larger representation.

So far so good. Let the remedy be promptly applied to the fullest and fairest extent.

*But L. has not gone far enough.* The evil and wrong he exposes and laments, are not the only ones attaching to the present delegate system. Neither are they the most serious and detrimental to the true interests of the church; and what is still worse, of evangelical christianity. Doubtless, it is hard to put up with *une-*

*qual* representation. Is it not far harder, however, to be subjected to the wrong of misrepresentation? That 60,000 Eastern members of the church should have no more votes in a Synod than 20,000 Western members, may well cause brother L. to feel regret. But what has he to say to the fact, that 50,000 of those 60,000 (not to make the disproportion still greater) are not only unequally represented, but not *represented at all*, or utterly *misrepresented*?

To show what we mean, and set the matter forth in a plain, direct way, let us follow L.'s example in appealing to figures.

*Lancaster Classis*, (East), has, in round numbers, 4000 members. Of these *at least 3500 are really opposed to any such radical change* in the *doctrines and worship* of the church as the *new-order movement* contemplates and involves. But what opportunity have those 3500 of being represented at any of our Synods on this subject? How many of the 4000 were represented at Cincinnati by Drs. Gerhard and Apple, Revs. Snyder, Pilgrim and Heilman, and the elders present from Lancaster Classis? Whom did the three delegates from the College and Seminary represent? Brother L. did not think of the inequality involved in a fact like this. How greatly it will deepen his expressed regret, when he reflects upon it.

*Eastern Pennsylvania Classis* has, say 16,000 members. Being pretty well acquainted with the congregations of that Classis, we can speak pretty confidently of their views upon the vital questions which have been agitating the church. It may be safely asserted, that if the people of East Pennsylvania Classis were frankly told what the new-order movement really intends and means, in the way of radical change in our doctrines and worship, not 500 members could be found in the entire Classis who would favor the movement. The other 15,500 would be decidedly opposed to it, and to every measure used to advance it.

By whom now are those 15,500 generally represented at the Synods? By whom were they represented at Cincinnati? Is it not a simple fact, that they were not represented at all, or rather that they were *misrepresented*? The delegates from East Pennsylvania, no doubt voted conscientiously, and according to their convictions, on points affecting the new-order revolution; and we do not blame them for that. But that is not the point. Brother L. argues, justly, that the 60,000 members of the Eastern church are entitled to a fair representation. This must mean, of course, not simply that they should have a fair proportion of delegates,

but, which is of far greater account, that those delegates should truly represent the views and convictions of those whose nominal representatives they are.

These illustrations might be extended to other Classes, but they will suffice for our purpose. And it must certainly be admitted, that they expose a serious wrong. The acts of a Synod so constituted, not only fail to represent the true mind of the church, on controverted points. They do more and worse. And doing so, to what results must they ultimately lead?

But, is there no remedy for so flagrant a wrong? There is, and a very simple one. It is this: Let every congregation throughout the church be told publicly, honestly and unequivocally, all the material and essential points involved in the new-order, high-church movement. Without evasion or concealment, inform them of the great changes it proposes in some of the fundamental doctrines of the church, and in the worship of the church. Show them how far and how seriously the new doctrine and cultus differ from the historical spirit, life, faith and practice of the Reformed church. Then afford each congregation a full, fair opportunity, of selecting an elder as their delegate to Classis and Synod, who shall truly represent their views. Finally, let each pastor and elder so selected, carry out by their votes, the views of the congregation so ascertained. Then would the delegated Synod, whether acting in the name of 20,000 or 60,000, truly represent the church.

Until something like this is done, we shall not only have unequal representation, but *misrepresentation*.

---

#### A SIGNIFICANTLY INTERESTING OCCASION.

By what was doubtless regarded as a happy coincidence, the recent special meeting of the Eastern Synod was held in Lancaster, and on the seventieth birthday of the Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D. To whom the credit of first observing the coincidence, and of the proposition to make due account of it belongs, has not been published. It was, however, and quite naturally, made the occasion of a congratulatory surprise call upon Dr. Nevin at his home (Cærnarvon) near Lancaster, of the presentation of a costly gold watch



and chain, as some slight token of regard, and of a presentation address by Dr. Gerhart, in the name of the donors, and a reply by Dr. Nevin. A report of what took place was published in the *Daily* and *Weekly Express*, (and probably other papers), in Lancaster. That report furnishes the text of what we feel prompted to say on the subject, due allowance being made, of course, for such slight errors as even the best short-hand writer and reporter is liable to commit in taking down from mere hearing what may have been somewhat rapidly uttered.

First of all, we feel warranted in saying, that considering the occasion in its more *privately personal* character, there were many others who could have cordially joined in the demonstration, besides those who were there. For Dr. Nevin in such a private and personal respect, they entertain, probably, as true and genuine regard as those who actually participated in the "ovation," and they cherish as sincere wishes for his personal welfare. They may differ widely and materially from his views. They may feel aggrieved at his public course during the past twenty or more years, and have felt constrained openly and strongly to oppose him in that course. They may feel painfully convinced that his influence as a writer and a teacher has been antagonistic to the true faith and the interests of Evangelical (Reformed) Christianity. And they may deplore that his talents and opportunities should so far, in their conviction, have been turned against a cause which should have received his devoted and earnest support. And all this would, of course, affect their sentiments toward him personally. At the same time, notwithstanding these things, and others connected with the manner in which he has sought to propagate and further his peculiar views and measures, those so affected still could, and we believe did, continue to cherish personal regard, and cherish it to-day. Doing this, they can sincerely unite in the congratulations extended on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, and in the devout prayer that his last years may be his happiness and best.

But leaving the occasion in this purely private and personal view, the use which was made of it in another respect has, very naturally also, produced a different impression, and seems to demand some special notice in another way. Instead of allowing the pleasant opportunity to pass with such tokens of private personal esteem as might have fairly expressed and represented more

generally entertained sentiments, advantage was taken of it for narrower partisan purposes. It was not the man, the Christian, or the scholar, as such, to whom the congratulations were offered, but to the founder of a so-called new system of philosophy, to the father of a so-called new system of theology, to the reformer of the Reformation. And the ovation was received in the sense and spirit in which it was thus offered.

Just and serious exception may be taken to this feature of the case. The propriety of turning a special meeting of the Synod, in which, had all the delegates entitled to a seat been present, in addition to those really there, there would have been at least a score, (that is, about one-third of the whole number in attendance), who could not have joined in *such* a demonstration, into an occasion for the display of partisan admiration, may well be questioned. It is easy to see the painfully awkward predicament in which that score would have been placed. *Personally*, they might have participated. But they could not have done so without either tacitly assenting to what was said, and to the avowed meaning of what was done, or assuming the ungracious and painful posture of open protest against it. To have voted in the Synod, against the proposed ovation, or to have refused to take any part in it, would have, in like manner, placed them in a false and unfair position. In this view, therefore, the affair, as managed, must be confessed to have been unhappily conceived, and as unhappily executed. And others have fully agreed with us in saying, that instead of regretting our absence, it may be deemed providential for us that, by a fair chance, as one may say, we were not there. Hereafter, when special or other meetings of Synod are to be converted into occasions for such partisan displays, it is but due to all concerned that the purpose should be previously and publicly announced. True Christian courtesy, as well as principle, require this.

The real purpose and character of the occasion, as well as its leading features, are indicated by the congratulatory address of Dr. Gerhart, and the response of Dr. Nevin. There are some things in both of which we do not care to take special notice. We refer to what may be fitly termed their very egotistic and strongly "mutual-admiration" characteristics with regard to the particular movement represented by the parties in the case. All *that* may be a matter of taste, and *de gustibus non, &c.* Besides, the leaders

of the movement in question have been so long and lavishly given to self-laudation, that, like the man who adorns his stories by continued repetition of: "Says I," and "then I said, says I"—the habit may be unconsciously indulged, and rather innocent, however distasteful. If it were indulged playfully, or in the way of a mere expletive, it would probably not be observed. But it is mostly done with so much gravity, and dignified assumption, that the manner of it seems to mean more than the self-complacent flattery itself.

Apart from this, however, the addresses, especially Dr. Nevin's reply, abound, brief as they are, in statements, assumptions, and declarations, which are of far greater account, and may well challenge consideration and criticism. It must be remembered, of course, that at least as far as Dr. Nevin's reply is concerned, it was made, as we suppose, extemporaneously. It would not be just, therefore, to hold him strictly responsible to the letter for what is reported. But there has been opportunity for revising, and, if thought needful, for correcting or modifying the address as first published, so that its latest form may be taken as fully endorsed.

Instead of attempting to give a synopsis of the addresses, separately, which our space forbids, much as we might desire to do it, we shall have to limit the present article to quotations, setting forth points of chief significance, under successive heads.

*Nevinism Acknowledged to be a Distinct Movement or System.*

The *first* point, then, worthy of notice, is the assumption and acknowledgment that what, for brevity and definite comprehensiveness may be called *Nevinism*, is a *peculiar and distinct movement or system, which has sprung up in the Reformed church*. This is claimed, and somewhat boastingly assumed, in Dr. Gerhart's address, and is assented to, or even affirmed, in Dr. Nevin's reply. Nothing else or less than this can be meant by such declarations as the following in Dr. Gerhart's address:

"A quick and active response greeted your positive teaching, from the bosom of the College and Seminary, and from the heart of the Reformed ministry and the Reformed church. Very soon co-laborers arose from among your friends and students, who have stood firmly by your side, coöperated with you in the work of reviving faith in the objective reality of the Christian Revelation,



and the supernatural constitution of the Christian church, and have multiplied your educational activity in manifold directions. The fundamental principle of your teaching, has thus leavened these institutions and others which have been planted by their alumni, and has permeated to its farthest limits the communion of the Reformed church."

Notwithstanding the studied characteristic cautiousness with which this, and similar statements are made, their purport is obvious. Dr. Nevin may be supposed to have understood them. And that he understood them as we have taken them, is clear from such declarations in his reply as the following :

Speaking of his entrance into the Reformed church, and certain consequences of it, he says : " In a short time I had every privilege which I wished to use and enjoy in a salutary way. \* \* It (that is his coming into the Reformed church), accomplished, though I did not see the means at the time, *a birth* in me by the studies and associations into which I was brought by my church relations, *and the change in myself is as great as in the church at large.*

\* \* It has been a great gain to me in every way, and *I rejoice and glory in the new order of life*, and I have realized (afresh), this day the joy that I have ever had in these truths, views and principles. \* \* If I had been taken away before I saw *our principles established*, and *before I had sent men out to defend the truth*, (as assumed to be involved in those principles), it would have been felt that all was to run out into the sand. \* \* *Our system of thought* is seen in the sphere of the ministry, which represents this general movement. Our institutions (have a) *basis of thought* \* \* *which will assert itself* from one generation to another ; and this is one of the greatest arguments for its truth and solidity, that it has a self-perpetuating force, by (producing) living men who attend the institution; and then go out and send others into *its ways of thinking and truth, in their relation to a living principle* which has taken in (?) a great many minds, &c."

To these quotations we add only the following, taken from the address as published in the *Messenger*, for the eyes of the whole church :

" I had lived some thirty-seven years before I came to Mercersburg, (that is, entered the German Reformed church); had done some work ; had formed intimacies, and passed through experiences on which I still look with fond recollection. But that precious time

has become for me, alas, like the memory of a dream, or *a meditation among the tombs*; and for those now around me, it is much of course, as if I had never existed at all. \* \* If I have, under God, rendered such service *as you say*, to the German Reformed church, *in her regeneration of the last thirty years, it has been only by going through a regeneration myself.*"\*

These extracts, in which we need hardly say the italicising and explanatory clauses in brackets are our own, plainly prove our point. The claim, indeed, is not a new one. Rather have the father and leading disciples of the Mercersburg theology all along boasted, that they had introduced a new system, a distinct order and movement of philosophical, theological and ecclesiastical thought, not only into the German Reformed church, but into the very heart of American Protestant Christianity. But whilst the claim had often before been pressed, it is significant for us that it should be so boldly and unequivocally re-avowed at this time.

In one sense, and that a most unfortunate one, the claim is true. Though it furnishes reason for shame and reproach rather than for boasting; and although it is a false claim as intended by those who urge it, it is only too palpable that Nevinism is an order of thought, a movement radically diverse and distinct from the historical faith, thinking and life of the Reformed church. It may well be admitted to require a change equal to a *regeneration*, in the Nevinite sense, of that greatly abused term. Being thus admitted anew, let us not be charged with "an atrocious libel" (to use one of Dr. Nevin's strong phrases,) for accusing it of this.

Let there be no misunderstanding. Nevinism is not charged by us with being *absolutely* a new order of thought, a new system, or a new theological and ecclesiastical movement. Indeed, we positively deny that it is such, and have often denied it. It presents nothing new in any of its essential (if it has any real substance), or fundamental (if a house on a quagmire can be said to have a foundation) principles or notions.

Its so-called *Christo-centric* principle rests on an assumed organic conjunction (in the incarnation) of the nature or substance of the Godhead with the nature of humanity, resulting in a thean-

---

\*None of these quotations will be found in the carefully revised report of the address subsequently published in the *Messenger*. And yet the *Messenger* had, or might have had, the full verbatim report of what was said, as a guide in preparing its account of the reply. Why were such remarks as the above omitted?

thropic nature, and involving a pantheistic element obtained from the mysticism of the middle and later ages, and modified by the subsequent pantheism of Schelling and others.

Its peculiar notions of the church, the sacraments, the ministry as a specific priesthood, and absolution, may be found on thousands of pages of Romish, Puseyite, and ultra-Lutheran writers, running back from 1848 to that sad period of the church when such favorites of Dr. Nevin as Cyprian, Cyril, and like-minded hierarchists exercised fatal dominion over the faith and polity of the church. And in all their advocacy of errors regarding these points, there cannot be found in the *Mercersburg Review*, or any articles or sermons which have issued from the schismatical party it represents, a single argument or illustration which cannot be traced to those poisonous sources.

Its denunciations, caricatures and ridicule of evangelical Protestantism, its assaults upon the distinctive doctrines of that Protestantism, such as imputation, justification by faith, private judgment, an open Bible, the ministry as in no other sense a priesthood than that of the universal priesthood of all believers, of the sacraments as signs and seals of grace previously bestowed by the Holy Spirit through the Word, the Gospel—all these denunciations and assaults are simply reverberations of the croakings of Romish frogs from the Pontine marshes, or the hisses of Romish serpents from the crevices in the walls of the Vatican. Tetzels and Sampsons could, in this respect, have learned nothing from *Mercersburg* which they did not know long before. Moehler and Balme anticipated Drs. Nevin, Apple and Gans, if they did not furnish them with text-books for their anti-Protestant tactics.

There was a time when some of us were simple, ignorant or confiding enough not to see this, or believe it. The school at the foot of the North Mountain, when it started out on its peculiar mission or crusade, about 1848-50, was accredited with profound originality. But this foolish fancy has been exploded, and those once regarded as great discoverers of thought, seem after all to be only imitators and copyists.

Even prominent Romanists have found out this fact, and congratulated the (now) Lancaster theologians upon their adoption and advocacy of many distinctively Popish tenets.

But whilst Nevinism is in *this sense not* a new system or movement, but merely a second, third, or hundredth-hand affair, it is



new, utterly new, root and branch, heart and tongue, in theory and practice, for the Reformed church. And this is what we mean by our accusations against it, and what we consider to be admitted by the quotations given above.

*This Movement or System Concerns Things Fundamental.*

A second admission made in these Lancaster addresses is, that the movement represented by the parties, the system they personate, *concern the very foundations of the faith and practice of the church.*

As seen in one of the preceding quotations, Dr. Gerhart expressly refers to "the fundamental principle" of his great Master's teaching; and he subsequently lauds him for his bold and fearless "*assertion of a positive faith*," as in opposition to "errors in doctrine and practice."

To this Dr. Nevin responds by saying: "It has been our privilege to give a mighty evidence to the truth, and *particularly to truth of the more fundamental kind.* \* \* Our church movement has been a great movement in the history of our Christianity; \* \* our influence has gone out into other churches."

Such phrases must, of course, be taken and understood in their Mercersburg sense. By "fundamental principle," and "truth of the more fundamental kind," are meant the distinctive theory and tenets of Nevinism. By a "*positive faith*," Dr. Gerhart meant, and Dr. Nevin and others understood, Mercersburg theology, which has for years been proclaiming itself the teacher and advocate of the only living and positive theology to be found in American protestantism, which has been roughly chided and ridiculed as only negative and false.

Furthermore, rightly to appreciate such assertions, it is needful to remember still more unreserved declarations made heretofore in other connections, in which the fundamental character (in a bad sense) of the entire Nevinite movement, has been frankly avowed.

This feature of the new-order movement should never be lost sight of. No protestations of fidelity to the Reformed church, with whatever seeming sincerity or earnestness they may be made, should be permitted to blind or mislead us. Dr. Gerhart may now use all the arts of sophistry, and solemn asseverations of fidelity to the Reformed faith, he pleases; he may deceive himself

thereby and hope to draw others unto his way of putting the case. Nothing of this specious sort, however, can make us forget the famous tract of 1862-63, (The Liturgical Question), or what is boldly taught in many articles of the *Mercersburg Review*. Mercersburg theology *has* to do with the fundamentals of our old evangelical faith, in the way of sapping and subverting them. It *has* sought in this radically revolutionary sense to *regenerate* the theology and cultus of the church, by doing with them what it falsely teaches is done in spiritual regeneration; that is, introducing an essentially foreign and different life element (or rather what it holds to be such) into our theology and cultus, and converting both into *a generically new thing*, which is *not Reformed*, but virtually Romish. And how Dr. Gerhart, with all those facts of the past before him, with which he must be acquainted, could make some of the declarations found in his address, which ignore or contradict those facts, presents a riddle of which we do not care to give a solution. Did he forget the articles on Cyprian and early Christianity? Did he forget the address delivered at Dr. Wolff's inauguration? Did he forget the apostasies to Popery; and that one of the misguided ones who have fallen away, was then living almost within the sound of his voice? And did he forget that Mercersburg theology, that is, his own theology, and that of the person he was congratulating, are held justly responsible in a large measure for those apostasies?

It may have suited his purpose, and the occasion, to forget these things. But others do not and will not forget them. Neither will they forget that these things all prove that the new-order movement vitally affects fundamental principles in faith and in practice.

As to the particular doctrines and usages in regard to which it does so, we need not repeat them, after having indicated them on a previous page. Only let the point now under notice be carefully borne in mind. Then will the church better understand what may be expected in the future, from a movement which has yielded such bitter fruits in the past. Then, too, will we be less likely to be deceived by any plausible assertions or measures which the pressure of recent events may seem to constrain the advocates of this new movement now to make and adopt.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

It will doubtless be as gratifying to our patrons as it is to ourselves, that we are able to occupy the pages devoted to the Repertory with public addresses and essays delivered by members of the College. These not only serve to exhibit the ruling mind and spirit of the institution, but also to show how it is striving to exert a good influence, in a practical way. They open windows through which friends abroad may look upon the school, and see what is being done.

The first article below, is a sketch of an address delivered by Prof. Snyder, of the Academic Department, at the recent anniversary of Washington Hall Institute. The other is one of the addresses delivered at the anniversary of the Zwinglian Society. Others will appear in the May number of the Repertory.

---

### OUR PURPOSE IN LIFE.

Our life is one of constant change. The machinery of society is in continual motion. We could not stand still if we would. We must either wear out or rust out. What we are, or what we may be, is often determined by surrounding circumstances. Our thoughts, purposes and actions are frequently influenced in this way; and however earnestly we may labor in a certain direction, influences from without often lead us to materially modify our course. Thus we are enabled, in part, to account for the endless variety of character, as well as for many of the mistakes that are made in life. We are apt to forget that individual life is made up of little things; that it becomes noble; that a character becomes great and good, only so far as our words and deeds—during each



successive moment—are themselves in accord with truth and right. Should every one act on this principle, failure would be impossible. The world greatly needs those men and women who will act the hero, or heroine, in *little* things, and on *small* occasions, and the great ones, like Franklin's dollars, will take care of themselves.

Many noble hearts, capable of bestowing untold good upon humanity, have ceased to beat and are now unknown to the world, because their condition in life seemed to deny the opportunity. Many noble minds have thirsted to drink of the fountain of knowledge, but have passed away without realizing the earnest desire of their souls. They deserve our tenderest and most heartfelt sympathy. They longed for the privileges which we enjoy,

“ But knowledge to their eyes, her ample page  
Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll;  
Chill penury repressed their noble rage,  
And froze the genial current of the soul.”

It is cheering, however, to look at the other side of the picture, and note the numerous instances wherein brave hearts and determined spirits have triumphed over all obstacles, however great, and instead of being controlled by adverse circumstances, have themselves been the controllers. Success in its highest form is perhaps not always attained where the effort is made to gain a higher standard in life. Nevertheless, the result in every case proves a trial worthy, and will surely bring an ample reward. With due allowance for all exceptional cases, we believe that in this favored land no one's life need be a failure. Many people seem to spend all their days trying to find some great thing to do, and consequently do not find it. We must not be idle, but must know our opportunity, and strive with all diligence to improve it.

“ There is a tide in the affairs of men,  
Which taken at its flood leads on to fortune.”

The dreams of youth must be superseded by sober, earnest, every-day facts. It is often hard to realize our true condition, and so we pronounce the world cold, selfish and unfeeling. But there never was a truer maxim than that which declares, “life is what we make it.” Are you preparing to act your part in the drama of life? Cease your dreaming! Resolve to act in earnest, you cannot otherwise succeed.

Being fully persuaded that "life is real, life is earnest," define your purpose, choose your vocation, and go to work with a will. If you have lived thus far without a purpose, choose it immediately; or if you have got on the wrong train, and think it likely you will be carried too far in the opposite direction, get off at the very next station; but do not jump off while the train is in motion, lest you break your neck. Next to "choosing whom we will serve," one of the most important decisions we have to make, is that of deciding upon our calling in life. Mistakes in decision are sometimes attributable to ourselves, sometimes to others. The parent cannot be too careful when he attempts to compel his child to labor in a certain direction for which he may have neither talent nor taste. How many do we see who are endeavoring to act that part for which they were not intended; though perhaps credit is due them for having made *some* choice, which, as Dr. Hodge says of the Roman Catholic religion, "is better than none at all."

When the efforts of parents and teachers to prepare us for the busy scenes of life have ended, it is for us to show by our own actions whether we will be somebody or nobody. By all means, then, go not through the world without a purpose. In this good land, where society is untrammelled by the law of caste, where the vast fields of science and knowledge, and the innumerable variety of industrial arts are open to all, no one need greatly mistake his calling.

The success of a truly noble life is not measured by temporal gain. The taste in acquiring riches fosters discontent, and often leads many to abandon an honest trade or profession, to accept some "agency;" which, in most cases, fails to secure the much coveted "salary," the only success about the whole transaction being the victim's success in losing a good situation. Thus has grown in society that prevalent evil of too few learning useful trades, and faithfully and honestly practicing them, when learned. When the principles of virtue shall be exemplified in the lives of those who are not in ignorance as to what is required of them, may we not hope that the time will come when the disproportionate elements of society will properly adjust themselves, and thus restore that equilibrium which shall make everything work together harmoniously for the good of each and all.

But beyond all plans for personal happiness and temporal wel-

fare, our purpose in life should be noble and elevated. Not visionary, nor like a new garment, to be used but seldom, for fear of wearing it out too soon ; but one of real value, that we may be proud to follow on all occasions, and in all relationships of life. If we live heedless of the voice of conscience, or are pursuing a course prejudicial to the welfare of our neighbor, or of the community, the sooner we abandon such a course the better.

Grievous wrongs and untold misery have been engendered and encouraged, in state and nation, through the pernicious idea that the great object of life is to "make money." "A man's life consists not in the abundance of things which he possesseth." He cannot afford in the few years allotted to him, to sacrifice precious time at the shrine of mammon. It may fill the pocket, but it will starve the soul.

We must remember that we have no right to live for ourselves alone, nor to use the powers bestowed upon us by an All-wise Creator for selfish ends. We rest under obligations to others ; let us seek to discharge them. There are a thousand ways in all the walks of life in which we can rebuke the promptings of self ; and whether we have ten talents or one-tenth of a talent, we will be all the happier for whatever we do to make others happy. Do not fail to honor every worthy example, however humble ; but beware of the false gods society would have you worship. Have noble aspirations. Rise above the groveling, selfish animal, and though all the world should prostrate itself before the golden calf, live up to the standard you have marked out, and never let yourself be tempted to abandon or to lower it. Thus will you serve yourself, benefit society, and glorify God.

W. H. S.

---

#### TRUE REFORM.

FROM the pages of both secular and ecclesiastical history, we learn that the sorest evils which at any time afflict humanity, are moral and spiritual, both as to their nature and consequences. It is not necessary to enter into an enumeration of instances in proof of this assertion. It is clearly evident from this fact that all man's acts can be traced to the inmost centre of his spiritual being, and



are but the manifestations of his inward moral state. It is only the more general application of the truth : Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.

This fact would seem at once to suggest to a thoughtful mind the only proper remedy for the effectual removal of moral evils in the world. The nature of the disease must decide the kind of medicine required to effect a cure. The means employed to secure the world's reformation, must correspond in their nature with the character of the disorders to be reached. Material weapons cannot be effectually employed in a warfare against evils that have their seat in man's depraved and corrupt heart. A power emanating from a higher source must be brought to bear, so to speak, upon the soul of humanity, in order to the accomplishment of *that* work of reform which the world so much needs.

There is no cause for hesitation in saying, that this power is Christianity, and that it alone is the hope of the world. The great commission to the primitive Apostles of the church, was to teach all nations the doctrines of the kingdom, thus indicating the only true method of christianization. And we may reasonably assume, that the Divine Redeemer was fully acquainted with the numerous disorders attaching to the world then ; that he foreknew the moral and spiritual diseases that should afflict mankind in the future ; and that He would, accordingly, prescribe for the healing of the nations, a remedy best suited to the demands of the case. According to divine appointment, therefore, the only panacea for the world's distempers, is the power of a living Christianity.

In this light we may briefly notice, by way of further elucidation, a few cases at hand.

A preliminary movement has lately been inaugurated by a body of eminent statesmen and divines, looking to a formal recognition in our National Constitution of some of the great facts of the Christian religion. The end proposed by the recent action of the National Association, cannot fail to meet with the hearty approbation of all that have at heart the true welfare of the nation. Only in so far as we are a Christian people, can we ever hope to be prosperous and happy, and to escape the inevitable judgments visited in all ages upon the nations that forget Him who rules not only in the armies of heaven, but among the kingdoms of earth. God speed the day when we shall not only bear the name of a Christian nation, but really being such, shall show it by an open

acknowledgment in our National and State Constitutions of the great truths of Christianity.

It has been charged upon the movement in question, that it is an attempt to propagate Christianity by the use of carnal weapons, and that it therefore runs directly counter to the spirit and letter of the Gospel. This charge, however, has been proven to be false. It is declared that the end proposed is simply a national recognition of God, and Christ, and the Bible, as the Author, the Ruler, the foundation of law, and the supreme ruler of nations. And ought not a country to acknowledge the hand of Him by whom she has been brought through war and bloodshed, and garments rolled in blood, to the high station she now occupies among the nations of the world?

But whilst this much may be said in favor of the movement, we may rejoice that no more has been attempted. For it is manifestly not the province of the State to become a propagandist of religion. All efforts to legislate a State or Nation into Christianity must, in the nature of the case, fail of accomplishing their end. Would a Jew, for instance, be made more of a Christian by holding citizenship in a country in whose constitution Christ is recognized as its ruler? Will an Atheist, a Pantheist, a Rationalist, be made more Christian by political legislation? It is not possible that the carnal weapons of legal enactment should ever effect a cure of a moral disease. Infidelity, skepticism, and rationalism, are all evils resulting from a wrongly-set and depraved heart, and can never be reached by a resort to civil legislation. The power of truth, inherent in Christianity itself, and brought to bear upon the people through the church, as the channel appointed for that purpose, must correct all moral and social evils. If it fails, the world must perish.

The "Local Option," or rather local prohibition question, furnishes a case of a similar character. Our people have lately been giving an expression of their sentiment by their suffrages on a very important movement, and the result has been very encouraging. We should hail with delight every legitimate effort to arrest the progress of the car of intemperance in its hell-bound work of destruction. All hail the day when man, the image of God, the child of immortality, the heir of eternity, shall be freed from those corrupting and contaminating influences that sink him to a level with the brute, and be raised to that position which, in

his creation, he was destined to occupy. The restraint placed upon those addicted to intoxicating liquors, in the granting of no-license, cannot fail to have a salutary effect upon the morals of the people. No one can dispute the right of the State to repeat a law which it has formerly enacted, and its wisdom in this case is clearly evident. An important step has thus been taken in the work of reform, by removing, to a great extent, the temptation to an evil as great as it is accursed.

But let no one think that such outward restraint by legislation will ever be a radical remedy against the evils connected with intemperance. A moral disease, like drunkenness, requires treatment by means corresponding in their nature with the disorder sought to be remedied. An analysis of the incipient state of a drunkard's life would, we think, teach us that he first thinks of the glittering, poisonous cup. Next, he desires it. This desire soon becomes so strong that it overcomes his better judgment and will; and, as the result of this process, he acts—he drinks. Thorough reform now must begin with the source of the evil. Let *that* be morally righted, and all his outward acts will be correspondingly good. The fountal source being cleansed, its water will thenceforth issue forth pure and sweet.

This fact Christianity alone, to the exclusion of all systems of religion and morals elaborated by men, fairly recognizes and fully meets. The religion of Mohammed fails here. Because it cannot effect a change in man's moral and spiritual nature, and thus convert him, is compelled to make progress with the sword. And even the very church professing to be the bearer of this Christianity, but having apostatized from the true faith in past ages, lost her moral power with the people, so that rivers of baptismal water applied to savage hordes, failed to change their barbarous natures. But to the Christianity of the Bible we must look for the only reformatory power properly applicable to men.

All reformatory efforts, consequently, which lose sight of the great truth we have been considering, must inevitably prove failures. The power of Christianity, of which the church, in the true sense of that term, is the seat and bearer, so long as she does not prove recreant to her solemn trust, must effect the world's reformation. And we must carefully distinguish between the true and the false in reform; and whenever we find men loud in their cry against the church; and seeking to prosecute the work of re-



form independently of her, there is something wrong. The church, with all her defects, is still the pillar and ground of the truth, and it is only by a firm adherence to Bible truths and Bible principles that the world can ever be reformed.

It is with shame that we confess, and yet we dare not close our eyes to the fact, that the church has often terribly failed in her duty, so as seemingly to necessitate the world to take out of her hands the work that properly belongs to her. There is a class of men in the churches that is ever behind the age, and that by a cold, calculating spirit of conservatism, would crush every enterprise and effort at reform that does not fall in with their narrow views of things. They regard with cold indifference every movement to ameliorate the condition of mankind. They see hundreds and thousands of their fellow beings ruined, soul and body, by the demon of intemperance, without ever putting forth a single effort to stay its progress. Nay, they even oppose efforts made in this direction by others who are more zealous than they in doing their duty to humanity.

Shall this state of things continue? If not, then let the churches take warning from the past, and awaken to their high calling. And let us, as true sons of the church, do our part by engaging in all the great and noble movements of the age in which we live. We cannot and dare not be conservative in that which is our duty. The reformers, Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin, and their co-laborers were, in a good sense, ultra to a man; and so must we be, if we would act well our part in the great conflict of life.

Christianity, as the only true reform, is not a failure. Rome's church, in her apostasy, may fail in the great work of reformation and civilization; upon the walls of a proud Vatican may be written concerning her mission, "mene, mene, tekel upharsin;" yet are Christ's true church, and the Christianity of which she is the bearer, destined to triumph in their contest with the powers of evil, and to hasten on the day when the work of the world's moral regeneration, started in the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and carried forward by His Apostles and true people in succeeding generations, shall be gloriously consummated. Then shall the heart of humanity, naturally so corrupt and depraved, be rescued from its spiritual and social degradation by the power of God in Christ, and beat once again in unison with the great heart of God, and burst forth in one harmonious, universal anthem of gladness and of praise.

F. F. B.

THE NECESSITY OF POPULAR EDUCATION.

A FEW months ago we found occasion briefly to notice some objections, prevalent in many of our farming districts, to a liberal education of our people. We then learned that such objections, however plausible they might at first appear, when tested, were found wholly groundless, and that those who entertained them were, to say the least, most sadly misguided. We now resume the consideration of this stereotyped but none the less interesting subject, with some remarks on the necessity of a sound education of the masses.

We would not be understood as pleading for a thorough training of the mind by a prescribed course of study, embracing from six to ten years in some college or university. This, of course, however desirable in itself, is not generally possible, or by any means necessary to meet the demands of the case. But who disputes the necessity of an education, whether obtained at the fireside, in the country school-house or at college, up to such habits of reflection and right-thinking as will disabuse the mind of the degrading idea that man's mission in life is merely to draw out a miserable existence of hard, manual labor, in connection with eating and drinking, sleeping and waking?

This low, sensual and material view of the purpose of life, runs directly counter to God's design in the creation of man. Is it reasonable for a moment to suppose, that a being should be endowed with such faculties and powers of mind as we know man to possess, if the Creator had intended that they should lie in a state of dormancy, without ever being called into active exercise? The mere recital of the thought bears absurdity on its face. Man has eyes in order that he may see; ears to hear; a tongue to speak. But could he ever see, or hear, or speak, without an early and constant use of these organs? In like manner must his powers of mind, of thought, of imagination and judgment, be exercised and disciplined, in order that he may be a full and perfect man.

This necessity of education embraces all classes and conditions of people. The farmer needs it no less than the professional man. The son and daughter of the humblest peasant stand equally in need of it. Why? Because the State and country are entitled to the *intelligent* suffrages of an understanding people. The Creator of us all, justly claims a *knowing* appreciation of his works and

ways. The farmer, following his plough, may find matter for thought and imagination wherever his eye may turn. He treads on countless plants and weeds that never attract his attention, and whose name and class he does not know, simply because he has never trained himself to *think* of what he sees. The soil he cultivates, year after year, he calls light or heavy, red shell or gravel. He knows nothing of its constituent elements, so as to supply in the form of some suitable fertilizer that which is lacking to make it more productive. The great light in the sky rises for him every morning, and sets with each successive night; and yet the influence of the sun's rays on his crops and vegetation are never once thought of by him. No awe and admiration fill his mind when he beholds the myriads of red lights bespangling the heavens at night. The grandeur of the night does not lead him in thought to Him who dwells above the stars, and holds them all in His hands. With regard to the moon, it is true, he is somewhat better informed.

She is his barometer and often his time-table for attending to many duties incident to gardening and building. But, unfortunately, even this bit of seeming practical information can be traced to the credulity of a superstitiously inclined ancestry.

The remedy now for all this is, to be found in a development of the thinking, discriminating and judging powers of the intellect. Man must learn to know himself as an intelligent, rational being, towering high above all creation around him, in virtue of the immortal mind with which he is endowed. Without this mental culture he will fail properly to appreciate the goodness and greatness of God displayed in his own wonderful being, as well as in all nature beside.

But why speak of God in this connection? Because, a true education includes also the development of the moral and spiritual natures in man. A culture of the intellect losing sight of this, is one-sided and imperfect. The person whose *heart* is not right, though his *head* be very wise, is liable of lapsing into infidelity and skepticism. This fact, no doubt, more than any other, created such a strong aversion to education in the minds of our pious ancestry. But with this qualification, which is but the *abuse* of a thing good in itself, we hesitate not to say, that only in so far as every one, to the humblest peasant in the realm, improves his



talents of mind by education, will he be able successfully to prosecute the work of life, and secure for himself that happiness which the Creator designed an intelligent being to enjoy.

We know that man's conceptions of things on earth are the result of the operation of the highest powers of his intellect. But this world is not his home. His religious nature will not rest satisfied with earthly realities. He seeks a knowledge of a being higher than man, of a place better than earth. But his conceptions of God, and eternal verities in the invisible world, are but faint and imperfect glimmerings of the real. In order to this conception it is evident, that the highest and most thorough development of both mental and moral powers is absolutely necessary.

This, as has already been said, is not possible with the majority of our people. But let each one do what he can, and all will be well.

SENIOR.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

*On the 27th ult.*, the Winter Term of the College, in its several departments, came to a close. With a single exception, the Term, though laborious, was an exceedingly pleasant one. But even the painful exception requiring an application of the extreme penalty of the school, has doubtless served the good purpose of proving a calm but firm determination to maintain proper discipline and authority, even at a temporary numerical loss. The moral gain far outweighs other considerations.

After a recess of ten days, the *Spring Term* will open on April 7th. There never was so fair a promise of a large accession to the number of students at this season of the year. More than twenty applications have already (March 20th) been made. The actual increase will probably exceed that number. The better the school becomes known, the more are the advantages it offers appreciated. It is liked for its *location*. Though retired, and quiet, and not exposed to surroundings calculated to tempt young men into vicious habits, it is by no means a lonely place. The thoroughness of its educational system attracts attention, and has secured general approval. Its religious character, as liberally, but most positively

and ecideddly protestant and evangelical, warmly commends it. In the hands of a full, competent, earnest, working Faculty, and under the general control of a Board of Directors deeply interested in its success, it seems to be regarded as just such a school as the people want.

Many of our friends will be glad to learn, that during the present year, six students have been immediately connected with the Theological department. The leading text-books used in theology proper, are Ebrard's Dogmatics and Hodge's Outlines of Theology, with constant reference to Heppe's Reformirte Dogmatik, &c. In connection with this, the students take a separate course in Ursinus' Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism. In this respect, the course is ruled by the historical standard theology of the Reformed church, and the requirements of the constitution of our church in this country. To this we feel solemnly bound by oath, as ministers of the reformed church! *Our theology is denominational in this sense, as it ought to be*, and is open at all times to inspection and criticism. It is, in reality, under more direct ecclesiastical supervision and jurisdiction than that of institutions whose instructors are so walled around by Boards, that they can hardly be reached by charges of error?

*The anniversary* of the Zwinglian Literary Society was celebrated on Thursday evening, March 27th. It was an occasion of equal interest with the anniversary of the rival *Schaff* Society, last term. The young gentlemen who spoke, were received with marks of public favor by the large audience assembled, and were regarded as having acquitted themselves with great credit. Of the character of their addresses, our readers can judge from those which we publish, as in the case of the sister association. Probably a somewhat detailed report of exercises may be furnished in time for insertion among our items of *Church* news. The *Salutatory* address was spoken by *George S. Sorber*, of Vincent, Pa. This was followed by orations, on *How to be Happy*, by A. W. Johnson, of Lower Providence, Pa.; on *God in History*, by A. E. Dahlman, Freeland, Pa.; on *The Duties of Life*, by J. H. Hunsberger, Trappe, Pa.; a German oration on *Die Wahre Bestimmung des Menschen*, by H. J. Welker, Green Lane, Pa.; and the Zwinglian Oration, on *True Reform*, by F. F. Bahner, Paxinos, Pa.

*The furnishing of the new chapel hall* has not yet been completed. Contributions towards this object will be thankfully received. The size of the hall is 43 by 48 feet, and it is calculated to accommodate an audience of upwards of 300 persons; if crowded, more than 400 can find place.

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*If all our subscribers* would respond as promptly to appeals for dues as those who will find their credit on the label with their names, it would greatly relieve and cheer us. Our exchanges generally seem to be compelled to reiterate similar appeals. It might be thought that such fellowship in trial should be somewhat consoling. Such comfort may suit others, but our good friend the printer, won't take it for cash, or even accept it as a promissory note. It is not negotiable in bank. Please send money in checks to order, or in Postal orders on *Philadelphia*.

*The Jesuits at Work.* Bismarck, the great Prussian statesman, is not only dealing with the Jesuits in the German Empire as they deserve to be dealt with, but is furnishing them an opportunity of exciting sympathy for them among the ignorant and unwary, by representing themselves as persecuted saints. In this there are two marvellous things. The first is, that Jesuits should have the impudence to pretend to be saints. The second is, that they should be so indiscreet as to call up memories of *their* diabolical cruelties in times past, by piteous appeals for sympathy. But hyenas will yell when they are bitten.

No doubt the Romish Jesuits have not been fairly dealt with, even by history. Its pages have failed to present a just and correct portrait of them. But there may be some apology for this. It is hard to draw portraits in the dark. And Jesuits hide their true character in the shades of darkness. History cannot tell the whole truth about them, for the simple reason that by their very system and policy the whole truth can never be known by any but their Head-centre, and possibly two or three of his most confidential counsellors. It is one of their first arts, to keep their hearts concealed, and that often, by covering them with their hands. No wonder that an astute and well informed statesmen like Bismarck dreads and detests the Jesuits. Few statesmen, probably, know as much about them as he does. And no wonder the Jesuits hate and abhor Bismarck. They know that he understands their spirit and craft. He has too nearly looked them through and through, for them to like him.

Just now these Jesuits are busy in trying to manufacture sentiment in their favor in America. They are getting up mass meetings, great popular demonstrations of indignation, at Bismarck, &c., and of zeal for civil and religious liberty. On March 24th, such a meeting of the *Germans* was held in the Academy of Music in Philadelphia. Among the prominent speakers on the occasion, was George Dering Wolff, esqr., formerly an ardent disciple of Dr.



J. W. Nevin, and a zealous co-worker with Drs. Apple, Gans, Gerhart, &c., in advocating and maintaining their peculiar theology. After the orators had delivered their artillery, strong resolutions were passed expressive of the sentiments of the meeting regarding the matters before it. No one can be more ready to admit, that among the laity of the Romish church there are thousands of excellent people, and of very loyal citizens, sincerely devoted to the cause of true freedom, religious and civil. But this should not be allowed to mislead public sentiment as to another fact. These meetings are, doubtless, really gotten up through the influence and efforts of Jesuits. And Jesuits are not friends of such freedom. For them, men and things in heaven, earth, and hades (as far as they can control them), are simply tools for the accomplishment of their own hierarchical designs. If Bismarck has his tricks, the Jesuits have theirs. And underneath all the coverings of the popular demonstrations they incite, it is not hard to see the crafty hands which work the wires. Banished from Europe, those ruling spirits of Popery must cast about for another home, and seek to find one for it in America. The plot is transparent.

*Speaking of Popery* very naturally reminds us of Dr. Fisher's present perplexity in trying to fix up some recent utterances of his Nevinite friends, through the *Mercersburg Review*, on *regeneration*. The trouble is, to make the *Review* harmonize, apparently, at least, with Reformed evangelical standards on the subject. In his effort to do this, Dr. F. has fallen into the rather awkward dilemma of exposing his own fatal disagreement with Nevinism, by setting forth its theory in terms which Drs. Gans, Apple, Gerhart, &c., must utterly repudiate. It has long been evident that Dr. F. don't understand Nevinism, or don't want to, so that he may the more easily quiet his conscience for defending it. This new attempt at explanation, affords a new proof of the fact. Of this proof the *Christian World* has been taking proper account, and in some articles which by their strong home-thrusts have been making a decided impression on the nervous system (if it has a system) of the editor-in-chief of the *Messenger*.

But the *World* is not quite right either in its statements of what Nevinites hold and teach, concerning Baptismal regeneration. It represents them as maintaining that a *moral* regeneration is effected through Baptism. This, however, is only half their error, and not the worse half either. The most mischievous and destructive part of their doctrine is, that an *organic* regeneration is wrought through Baptism. They hold and maintain that a seminal portion of an assumed theanthropic nature in Jesus Christ, glorified, is conveyed to the subject through Baptism, and that this is the germ of a *generically* new theanthropic life in the subject. In this way the church is, as Dr. Nevin has expressly declared, an actual continuation and development of the substantial theanthropic life of Christ. *This*, besides being open to other serious objections, is *pantheism*.

As the matter is worthy, however, of more special attention, a review of Mr. Rupp's article, and the Nevinite doctrine of regeneration, is reserved for future reconsideration. Meanwhile, let it suffice to say, that as on the sacraments in general, as well as other still more fundamental doctrines, so in regard to Baptism and regeneration, Mercersburg theology, or Nevinism, can be incontrovertibly proven to be anti-Reformed, unscriptural, and Romish.

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM *Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York :

The Holy Bible, According to the Authorized Version, (A. D. 1611,) with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican church. Edited by F. C. Cook, M. A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. II. Joshua—I Kings. 8 vo., pp. 624.

With the liberal and energetic zeal for which the publishing house named above have won a deserved reputation in other extensive literary enterprises, they are carrying rapidly forward the re-issue of the so-called "*Speaker's Commentary*." Our readers have been apprised that the work bears this general title, from the fact that it was first suggested by the Hon. J. E. Denison, the speaker of the House of Commons at the time. The American publication of the first volume was noticed some months ago? And the issue in a separate form of that portion of Vol. I, which comprised the book of Genesis, was noticed in the March number of the *Monthly*.

Volume II, now before us, covers the books of Joshua to I Kings, including the last. Rightly to appreciate the work, it must be remembered that its special design is to meet the wants of intelligent Christian laymen, by furnishing a commentary suited to the times, and meeting in a practical way difficulties, or seeming difficulties, raised by modern (skeptical) learning and science against the inspired Scriptures. It can in no proper sense be regarded as a rival, still less a substitute for Lange's Commentary, edited by Dr. Schaff, and published by the same firm. For the critical student of the Bible, this latter work continues indispensable and unrivalled. But, for most general use, the value of the *Speaker's Commentary* is indisputable.

[N. B. By a somewhat ludicrous freak of the type, in our March notice of another work by Scribner & Co., "*The Wonders of Sculpture*," was heralded as "*The Wonders of Scripture*." Of course the reader detected and corrected the mistake.]

*Galama*, or *The Beggars*, a story of the founders of the Dutch Republic.

Conflicting criticisms have been passed upon this story. One notice we have seen, pronounces it intolerably flat and dry. The diversity of judgment upon it may doubtless be traced to the application of a wrong standard to the book by those who have declared against it. If the main purpose of the author was to furnish an artistically executed, thrilling romance, of the Wilkie Collins style, for instance, he has certainly failed. But such was evidently not his purpose. To impress the facts and lessons of the times and events of the memorable period to which the story refers; to show by what labors, trials, and perils the work of rescuing the Netherlands politically and religiously from the grasp of Papal tyranny and cruelty, and to expose some of the craft and Jesuitical machinations by which Popery, through Spanish power, tried to crush down all efforts to escape from its chains—and, above all, to warn the State and the

church of the present day of new perils threatening both from an old foe, there were evidently the writer's great aim. And in this view we cannot but think that he has written a story which will be found pleasantly interesting and exceedingly useful. We wish it a wide circulation.

*Messrs. Claxton & Co.* have removed from their old stand to their new and splendid building, No. 626, Market street, Philadelphia. They constantly keep a large and excellent stock of books on hand, and purchasers should give them a call.

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

THE REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH—*Ministerial Changes*.—Rev. H. H. Sandoe, from Winamac, Ind., to Stonington, Ill. Rev. J. M. Grether to Hartsville, Starke county, Ohio. Rev. J. Niehoff, of Parma, Ohio, to Detroit, Mich. Rev. H. Daniel's address is changed to McKee's Half Falls, Pa. Rev. H. Mosser has received a call to the First Reformed church of Reading, the late pastor, Rev. Dr. Bausman, having taken charge of the new congregation recently organized there, and worshipping in the splendid new church in course of erection, the commodious lecture room of which is completed. Rev. G. H. Johnson to Easton, Pa., in charge of a new church formed there. Rev. Joseph B. Shumaker, Canton, O, has received a unanimous call to St. Paul's church, Lancaster, Pa.

INSTALLATION.—Rev. C. F. Hoffmeier was installed pastor of the Lutheran charge, Clarion Classis, on February 18, the services being conducted by Rev. J. F. Wiant, who preached an English sermon on the occasion, the pastor having preached in German.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCHES.—*Petersville, Pa.*, Rev. J. Fritzinger pastor, *thirty-two* additions are reported to the congregations composing the charge. *Columbiana, Ohio*, (Rev. J. Kendig,) after an interesting series of services, continuing two weeks, *five* were added to the church. *Fairfield, Ohio*, (Rev. J. M. LeFevre,) *fifteen* additions at the recent communion. *Ickesberg, Pa.*, (Rev. F. S. Lindaman,) a precious season of grace has been enjoyed, promising large accessions to the congregation. The charge is reported as being in a very flourishing state under the blessing of the Lord upon the labors of the pastor and earnest efforts of fellow helpers of the truth.

[Most cheerfully do we give place to the following special communications, as interesting in themselves, and sure to be acceptable to our readers. We would rejoice in receiving and inserting similar articles every month, and will be thankful to brethren who may furnish them.—ED.]

PHILADELPHIA, March 13th, 1873.

*For the Reformed Church Monthly:* Heidelberg Reformed church, Mellon



street, above 12th. This congregation, though young in years, being at present only a little over four years old, is furnishing signs of growth that are truly encouraging to all its friends, whether in the congregation or out of it. Its services being conducted upon the principles and in the spirit in which our forefathers worshiped, known as the free service, and in which our people engage freely and heartily, so that all can say that it is good to be there. Ever since our present pastor, the Rev. William C. Hendrickson, has been with us, (he being installed as pastor in October last), we have been actively and earnestly engaged in carrying forward the work of the Lord, and are rejoiced to be able to say, that the Lord has been with and blessed us far beyond our expectations or deserts. The pastor being in earnest for the salvation of souls, has given us a series of sermons which have delighted, cheered and benefitted his hearers; and as his sermons are earnestly spoken, and as earnestly listened to by his hearers, the very natural consequences necessarily have followed, opening the door of the heart, making room for the entrance of the Holy Spirit; old members becoming quickened, renewed and strengthened, others who cared nothing for the cause of religion and the salvation of their souls, have been made to cry out, What shall we do to be saved, and have been pointed to Him who said, Whosoever will, let him come and drink of the water of life freely; and many who have looked unto Him, not doubting, have been able to rejoice in a knowledge of sins pardoned, and a hope of eternal life. Our prayer meetings, as a general thing, are well, yea, very well attended. The prayers and exhortations given, are to the point; and as they come from the heart, they cannot help but reach the heart. The singing is earnest, and the spirit of the living God is seen and felt whilst operating upon the hearts and countenances of the children of the Lord. We can truly say, that we have a feast of fat things, and at times feel as though we could sit and sing ourselves away to everlasting bliss. Our services on the Lord's day are becoming more interesting, and the number of hearers is slowly but gradually increasing. Many strange faces are seen from Sabbath to Sabbath, which is truly encouraging. We have a working congregation, pastor, officers and members, and we feel incited to go on with the good work, giving God all the praise, as we are but poor insignificant instruments in His hands in carrying forward this work and labor of love. In the Sabbath-school we are doing a work for the cause of Christ, which we hope will tell powerfully for the good of man; and we already have the evidence of it in the conversion of some of our scholars, and the bringing of them into the church. And, what is better, the glorious liberty of the Lord Jesus Christ, who stands ready at all times to receive them, and for whose encouragement He says, Suffer *little* children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven. Our scholars are engaging earnestly and with all their hearts in the Sabbath-school services, and our hope and prayer is, that many of them may soon surrender themselves, soul and body, to the service of the great head of the church. We invite all of our visiting brethren, who spend a Sabbath or a Wednesday evening in the city, to come and see us, and unite with us in the services. On the Sabbath, we have church at half past ten; Sabbath-school at half past two; and church, in the evening, at half past seven. Wednesday evening service, at a quarter of

eight. We have our quarterly communion the first Sabbath in April, July, October and January, and we cordially invite all Christians who can and desire to come and be with us, and we will try in the name and in the fear of the Lord to do each other good.     W. H. S.<sup>r</sup>

*Residence of pastor, 824 North 10th street.*

NEWBURG, March 10th, 1873. 4

*To the Reformed Church Monthly, J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., Editor :*

*The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* was administered to the membership of Zion's congregation, near Newburg, Cumberland county, Pa., on Sabbath, March 9th, by Rev. H. H. W. Hibshman, of Waynesboro, Franklin county, Pa. The following were his subjects during the preparatory and communion services: Friday evening, 2 Cor. 1: 3, 4; Saturday, a. m., Luke 14: 17. "Come, for all things are now ready." Saturday evening, Matt. 16: 18; Sabbath morning, 1 Cor. 11: 24. The attendance during the progress of the meeting was very good, considering the inconvenience of travel, caused by snow-drifts and the thawing of snow. The subjects were fully mastered, the audiences well and profitably entertained, and general satisfaction rendered. The brother has the thanks of the congregation for the kindly services rendered in thus accommodating them. This congregation, together with that of Shippensburg, form a charge under Mercersburg Classis, and is at present without a regular pastor.     J. H.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—It has been frequently said of late, that Catholicism is on the increase in Prussia—the proof to be found in the new Catholic church convents, etc. Recent statistics prove this to be only absolutely so, not relatively. The Protestants are increasing more rapidly in proportion, so that Catholicism is relatively losing ground. This is especially the case in the provinces of Pomerania and Saxony, and even in Posen, Brandenburg and Silesia. In all Prussia there are about sixteen millions of Protestants, and half that number of Catholics. The Protestants predominate in the north, especially in Brandenburg, Saxony and Hanover, and the Catholics in the Rhine Provinces—Westphalia and Silesia. The free cities are largely Protestant, and the kingdom of Saxony numbers but 50,000 Catholics to about two millions and a-half of Protestants. In south Germany the mixture of the sects is stronger. Bavaria is largely Catholic, as is also Baden; in the latter country, the lowlands of the Rhine are Protestant, and the highlands Catholic. In Wurtemberg, Protestants outnumber Catholics about two to one—the latter living along the Danube, mainly. This predominance of Protestantism in Wurtemberg, is the more creditable, as the country is imbedded in Catholic Bavaria and Baden. In round numbers, there are in all Germany about 25,000,000 Protestants, and 16,000,000 Catholics, so that the former have the strongest battalions as well as the holier cause.

- THERE are no less than ten Evangelical churches in Rome; and three shops have opened for the sale of Bibles and Protestant books.

WM. PAINTER & CO.,  
BANKERS,  
No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF  
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

---

Gold, Stocks and Bonds

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE  
PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.

---

## MORNING SUNBEAMS

For the playroom, Schoolroom, and Nursery. Selected by Mrs. E. Prentiss for the little folks, to hang on their chamber and schoolroom walls, like the "Silent Comforter" in hospitals, and furnish a divine talisman for every day. Folio. 32 pp. 75c.; post. 10c.

## PRAYER.

A new and attractive devotional manual, containing suggestions and hints from our best writers, on the Lord's Prayer, and prayer in general. 104 pp. large 32mo. 20c.; post 4c.

## THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT.

Lessons from Christ's conflict and victory. By Rev. A. F. Dickson. The teacher of youth, the tempted and the troubled Christian, will find it valuable. 144 pp. 18mo. 40c.; post 8c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISSELL,  
1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.



# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

SPRING TERM, 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The WINTER TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, will open on Monday, APRIL 7, 1873, and continue sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

WILLIAM H. SNYDER, Instructor in the Academic Department.

J. G. NEFF, Tutor.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.—MAY, 1873.—No. 5.

---

“ONE MEDIATOR.”

By the great gospel fact to which our minds and hearts have been specially directed during the past few weeks, the doctrine of the mediatorial character and work of our Lord Jesus Christ has been again brought prominently into view. In this doctrine a point of supreme importance is that of the *sole Mediatorship* of the Redeemer. As there is but *one God*, so the Scriptures emphatically declare there is but “*one Mediator* between God and men.” And that Mediator is with equal explicitness affirmed to be “[*The man Christ Jesus*].”

Men need a Mediator. The spiritual and moral necessities of their condition as lost sinners required this. But they need only *one*, if one can be found sufficient to meet the exigencies of their case. Such a Mediator has been provided. The Gospel tells us where and in whom to find Him. It points directly to Jesus Christ. He is “*the Mediator*,” possessing in the fullest perfection all the attributes and qualifications which the case required. He possesses them so completely, that all need of any other, whether on earth or in heaven, is utterly excluded. He does this by having in Himself performed and suffered all that was required by the work of redemption. In and through Him, and Him alone, we have all needful “access to the Father.” He ever liveth to intercede for us and our needs. He has appointed no vicar, substitute, to make up for any falsely assumed insufficiency of His mediation. By virtue of the relation of His divine nature to His human nature, He is just “*such a High Priest*” as the penitent,

believing sinner wants, and as supplies all his wants. Every theory or system, therefore, which presumes to set up other Mediators, under whatever pretense, in whatever specious form of nominal subordination to Him, is dishonorable to Him, and subversive to the truth. And yet attempts are made to do this.

Such attempts have often been exposed and rebuked. The testimony of every Confession, and all the recognized theology of the Reformed church, bears strongly and earnestly against them. This is done so forcibly and practically in the following extracts from a recent address of Rev. J. Cotton Smith, D.D., of New York, published in *The Episcopalian*, that we are glad to transfer them to our pages, and believe that their circulation in our church will do good, especially at this time.

“There is such a thing as a *legal Christianity*, as well as an *Evangelical Christianity*. But if there is that element in our church who present the legal aspect of Christianity in any of its relations, then there is a need, which it is impossible for us to express, for us to raise up a ministry that has for its object the presentation of the Evangelical aspect of Christianity. It is possible for souls to be saved who have only the legal idea of Christianity! But how much more precious is the declaration of the soul; how much more joyous is the state of the believer; how infinitely more efficacious is the motive brought to bear upon the life of one who understands the Gospel in the Evangelical sense. He feels that having put his simple trust in the Saviour, he is saved, *saved* forever and ever. And that from God comes a new life of devotion, of praise, of Christian fidelity and love, of homage and of gratitude for the salvation which has been laid at his very feet; and thus he is saved ‘through the riches of grace, without money and without price.’

“The legal aspect of Christianity with which we are familiar in our church, is the SACERDOTAL; an aspect of Christianity, I undertake to say, when it is carried out to its logical results, inconsistent, absolutely inconsistent with the true meaning of the old word *ministry*. Sacerdotalism, full blown, is anti-Christian. It may be possible for misguided men to have certain Sacerdotal ideas and tendencies, where there may be still reserved enough of the true-system of the Gospel to save it from utter corruption. But carry out these tendencies, those ideas, and you have that system which is personified in Anti-Christ himself.



There are some points here that are of the utmost importance, and that Christian men and citizens should fully understand. Let them know that we have in our very church the seeds, and they are fast ripening, too, of the system of Sacerdotalism, which, as I say, when full blown, and having all the power which it covets, is fatal to Republicanism; fatal to education in any true sense of the term; fatal to the hopes of the soul; and fatal to the religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I say it is fatal to Republicanism, because Sacerdotalism everywhere is found associated with an institution antagonistic to the political, social, and religious rights of men. It is impossible for the two to stand side by side. Just as soon as men understand the true principles of citizenship, and their relation to the State, just as soon they will break away, not only from the shackles of civil bondage, but also from the shackles of religious and social bondage, and not only declare themselves free in the State, but also free men in Christ Jesus. Why, long ago, in this very State, when the system of negro slavery existed here, William III, that grand advocate and defender of civil and religious freedom, who laid the foundation of the glorious Protestantism of the Anglican Communion, or rather laid them anew, when about to be subverted for the second time, sent over a request to his old assembly in this province, that the negro slaves might be permitted to receive the teaching of the Christian schools, which through his agency were established here. And the reply was a very candid one: 'That it would be impossible to instruct the slaves in the fundamental principles of education and Christianity, without making them free men.' They would cease to be slaves. And thus there is in the lesson that is taught by the wonderful changes of the present day, which are shaking to their foundations the ancient civil and religious systems, that the great principles of liberty, civil and religious, and of education, are bound up with that evangelical view of Christianity in which it is the purpose of this Society to train up those who are to go forth into the ministry of our church.

"But I say besides that, that this Sacerdotal idea, when fully carried out, is fatal to Christianity itself. And though I have already alluded for a single moment to that, I wish to ask your attention for a moment longer to a more particular examination of that point.

"What is the Sacerdotal idea; the very essence of it? It is that

there is in the ministry of the church an order of men who come, in a very important sense, between God and man; and who perform certain acts towards God which are necessary for man. *Necessary*, mind you! Not in order to produce a moral impression upon him, but necessary in a perfunctory, mechanical way; so that, independent of this moral and spiritual exercise upon him, reconciliation may be effected between God and man. And when a man starts up amazed and asks, how that can be? how the Infinite Eternal God can be moved to reconciliation by the efficacious power of a human priesthood? the human priesthood must found its system upon some other claim than the mere fact of its constitution. What is it that he does? Here comes in the most marvelous device of Satan. He then makes an awful claim, that he is empowered to offer the *sacrifice*, [perhaps, to cover somewhat the grossness of the error, and to mislead the unwary and unsuspecting in regard to it, it may be called a *memorial sacrifice*, as in our New Order of Worship, Ed.] over and over again, which has been once offered on the cross of Calvary. The object, he says, is to bring the immense moral and spiritual power of the sacrifice to bear upon the souls and the minds of men; that it is necessary that it should be repeated; and, therefore, turning his back upon the moral and spiritual exercises of men, as if they were of no account in the matter, he offers, as he claims, that sacrifice which was once offered by the Lamb of *God* Himself.

"He turns then to the people, and declares to them that through this operation their sins are pardoned, and they receive incorporated into them, as the source in them of eternal life, the very literal body and blood of the Redeemer. Oh! never was a claim in the whole history of the world so awful as this! Never was there a claim made so adapted to deceive the credit of a deluded people as this! It lays its hands upon some of the profoundest feelings and aspirations of the soul. And a soul which would never be misled by skepticism, a soul that would never question the existence or providence of God; a soul which feels, though it cannot express or analyze it, the transcendent power of some great, inexplicable redemption wrought for it. Well, what is the consequence? You will find that a vast majority of men are satisfied with that; they do not seek to go any nearer to God than that, because they find they must sacrifice their sins in order to do that, and they can indulge in their sins by this mechanical means, by

which operation it is said they are renewed and reconciled to God, though they lead careless lives, and when they go into eternity, who can tell how unprepared they are.

"And there are others who fervently seek for God in such a system as this. There have been men held in the iron shackles of this system whose spiritual power we can almost fall down before in wonder and amazement, that they have been able to struggle through it all until they have placed their hearts right against the heart of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; they have found their way through it all, because a soul when once fairly aroused must find its way to Christ or die. But then contrast that with the feelings of the believer when he trusts only in Christ for salvation, and feels that all has been done by Christ, and needs no one to come between him and the Saviour. As the man gets a view of the Saviour's love, his sins become hateful to him in the holy presence of his Saviour, and he falls down at His feet, not in shame, because he is forgiven; not in anxiety and apprehension of the future, because he feels there is a foundation beneath him from which it is impossible for him to be removed; but with the hatred of sin, that leads him to say, 'Dear Saviour, for Thy sake I will sin no more.'"

---

LIVING TESTIMONY.

[DURING the tercentenary year (1863), of the Heidelberg Catechism, series of sermons were preached on the Catechism by eminent Reformed ministers in different parts of Europe. It occurred to a number of earnest and faithful Reformed pastors of Elberfeld, that it would serve many good purposes to engage a sufficient number of those ministers to furnish each a sermon for a *memorial* volume, which should thus show—*first*, the faith of the Reformed church, from its rise, in regard to the leading doctrines of grace; *secondly*, the fidelity with which the Reformed church of the present age, as a whole, clings to that faith; and *thirdly*, the unity or agreement which prevails in regard to Reformed doctrines as based in the Holy Scriptures, among leading representatives of its faith in different countries of Europe.



Those requested to contribute to this object, cheerfully complied. The result was, the collection and publication in a memorial volume of fifty-two sermons, by nearly as many Reformed ministers, one being devoted to the consideration of each Lord's day. The volume is a real treasury of truth. It is especially valuable at this time, and presents an exhibition of the principles and faith of the Reformed church, which is in most pleasing contrast with the perversions of Mercersburg theology; whilst, in such contrast, it painfully exposes the serious departures of that theology from our doctrinal standard.

[In the following extracts from a sermon by *Court-preacher Wil-  
sing*, of *Stargard, Pomerania*, our readers will find a clear and unambiguous statement of the doctrines of the Reformed church concerning the *Sacraments*, and their relation to *faith*. They will see, also, how widely the author's statements and views differ from the sacramental theology of Nevinism. In order to secure attention to this difference, we have italicised many passages which more plainly exhibit it. The sermon is on the 25th Lord's day of the Catechism, which should be referred to by the reader.]

Introductorily, the author dwells emphatically on the great Gospel truth, that "We are justified by *faith*, without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3 : 28. This, he says, is the ground and substance of the Gospel doctrine of salvation. "But *faith* is the immediate apprehension, grasping, possession and holding of the Redeemer and Saviour, who dwells in us by faith. In faith the Christian has not merely a conviction of the truth of all the promises of his covenant God, but the covenant itself in the person of the Mediator, that is, in his fellowship; so that Christ lives in the believer, and the believer in Christ. *Without this* personal faith, no one can have part in the blessings of the covenant. Hence, the Word of God, and, in accordance with it, the Catechism points out the means of grace by which this saving faith is wrought and confirmed in the heart."

He then briefly explains the application of the text he had selected, as comprehensively setting forth the main points embraced in this Lord's day, (Eph. 1 : 13, 14,) and proceeds to show that *the divinely appointed means* for begetting and confirming our faith, are :

1. The preaching of the Holy Gospel; and
2. The use of the Holy Sacraments.

Under the first head, the sermon shows conclusively that, according to the Catechism, it is by and through the Word, in distinction from the Sacraments, that the Holy Ghost works conviction, repentance, saving faith, a saving union with Christ; in a word, renewal unto life, with the peace, joy, consolation, hope and the powers of sanctification, associated with and springing from such living faith. Having established and explained this primary fundamental truth, the sermon next dwells upon the office of the *sacraments*, in the way of confirming this saving faith, as follows: [The extracts here given have been translated by a friend.]

Our Catechism further teaches, that the Holy Ghost who works faith through the preaching of the Gospel, confirms the same through the use of the holy Sacraments.

When the sinner first, through the preaching of the saving Gospel, apprehends the truth, his faith is yet weak, *the new man, Christ, has then begun to live in him*, but this life of grace, *like the life of a new-born infant*, is still feeble, it requires sustenance and strengthening; the world, the flesh and the devil, expose it to many dangers and temptations, and it is necessary to protect it, that it may not again die and be lost. Experience, indeed, says that when grace first penetrates, when first the penitent sinner lays hold upon the comforting grace of forgiveness, the soul leaps high for joy, body and soul rejoice in the living God. Psalms 84: 3. It appears so easy to be pardoned, with his Saviour to triumph over all his foes, he can scarcely think it possible that he can ever again waver in the faith, wherein he is so blessed; but such enthusiasm of joy in the first love, however delightful and glorious it may be, is no sure sign, is no security, is no healing.

We find, also, God be thanked, nothing whereon to rest, whereon to trust and depend, but upon the Lord's immutable truth and mercy, upon His Word. And where should our hearts find comfort if, where there is only its own weakness to contend with, that upon which it must trust fails, when it should impart strength? Whoever knows it not, the truly experienced in the way of truth know, that after times of reviving, there come again times of temptation. There come again the sins that we in our first love had so entirely and forever buried under the cross of Christ; there appear again the old lusts, which dwell in the flesh and war against the spirit, so that it appears to the honest Christian soul, as if it

had again lost the Lord, and it complainingly sighs: (Song of Solomon 3 : 1,) I sought Him whom my soul loveth ; I sought Him but I found him not. This is not the condition of the backslider, of one whose love, like that of Demas, the world has regained. It is not the wretchedness of those who despise grace, and crucify again the Son of God. No, for they love Jesus. O ! with what ardent longings ; they cast not away grace ; they crave for nothing but grace. The Lord has also, in truth, not been cast out of such hearts. But such hearts cannot delight in the Lord, they cannot rejoice, nor certainly believe that the Lord dwells in them. They have the Word, the beloved Gospel ; they believe also His promises ; believe that Jesus, His body and blood, His sacrifice and merits, heals and sanctifies the sinner. But, so long as they are not *sensible* of the healing comfort and the healing-power, they say, Have I really Jesus? Will Jesus yet come to me also? Does he also live in me? They require a confirmation of their faith, or to speak more explicitly, they require, as ordained and given by the Lord Himself, *a sign and seal attached to his promises*, which assure them, that they by grace, because of the one offering of Christ accomplished on the cross, *possess* Christ, and with Him, forgiveness of sins, righteousness and life. And this the Lord has given to His believers in the Holy Sacraments instituted by Him, which, also, according to Question 66, have attached to them *this signification, design and effect*. It is important, and well to be marked, that *the Holy Sacraments bestow nothing else but what the blessed Gospel promises, yea, what also the Word, by the agency of the Holy Ghost, actually confers upon those who believe the Word*. The Catechism clearly teaches in Question 67, that both the Word and the Holy Sacraments *direct our faith* to the offering of Christ on the cross *as the only ground of our salvation*. If we take, moreover, the short but plain definition of the small Heidelberg Catechism, 2 : 24, we find it there said : " Christ's true body given for us, is the real treasure of the Gospels and the Holy Sacraments." From this it is evident that our church, upon the basis of the Holy Scriptures, teaches that the Lord Jesus, who offered Himself for us as Mediator, Propitiator and Saviour, through the Holy Ghost, *as in the Word*—so in the Holy Sacraments—presents Himself to us, to have and enjoy Him. This the Lord Himself plainly says in His momentous discourse, (John 6), wherein He calls Himself the bread given for us to eat, whereof



whosoever eateth shall have life, verse 51. He also says, in verse 47, He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life; and verse 54, Whosoever eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life. More clearly it could not well be said, that He, the same Saviour, as the Bread of Life, as He who is the true, eternal life, *is as really received by those who believingly hear the Gospel as by those who in faith eat His flesh, and drink His blood, as is done in the Sacrament of the Holy Supper; that He—who sitteth in heaven upon His glorious throne—presents His flesh and blood, i. e. Himself, as He who offered Himself as Mediator for the life of the world to His believing members, through the operation and mediation of the Holy Ghost, who dwells in the members as in the head.* Now, it is true, we may ask: *Wherein, then, lies the important difference between the hearing of the Word and the use of the Holy Sacraments, if the believing Christian can apprehend and receive through the latter, nothing intrinsically other than that which he also receives through the believing acceptance of the Word of Christ?*

The difference, however, soon becomes apparent, and is truly a significant and comforting one. God will, through the use of the Holy Sacraments, *give us better to understand, and seal to us the promise of the Gospel, namely, that He, on account of the one offering of Christ accomplished on the cross, bestows upon us by grace, forgiveness of sins and eternal life.* The Gospel shows and assures every poor, penitent, grace-hungry sinner, that Christ has died for their sins, and risen for their justification. *Whoever believes this, with the true faith wrought by the Holy Ghost, possesses this death and resurrection of Christ, with all His grace and saving treasures.* Yet, as we have already shown, in delineating the experience of the children of God, it is necessary that this belief and life of faith should frequently be strengthened. For we are poor, weak creatures, and this the Lord knows well, and looks with compassion upon our weakness. *Therefore, He institutes the Holy Sacraments; the Sacrament of baptism as the sign and seal of this, that Christ HAS truly received us into His saving Communion; that He has made us share the power of His death and resurrection by which we are apprehended; that He has Himself come unto us and chosen our poor hearts for His dwelling-place.* Therefore, He institutes the other Sacrament—that of the Holy Supper, the Sacrament of growth, which nourishes in us *the already*

*existing saving and gracious life—to be the sign and seal that Christ Himself, through His spirit, truly comes to us anew, and His life in us is nourished and strengthened. In these visible signs of the Holy Sacraments, those who are baptized with water, according to the custom in holy baptism, and in the Holy Supper, have presented unto them, and received the broken bread and consecrated wine, have, by faith in the word of the promise, (which is really the promise of the Lord), perceptible evidence that that which they otherwise do not see, cannot feel, imperceptibly takes place. As surely as thou art baptized in the water of baptism, so shalt thou, for the strengthening of thy struggling faith, have assured confidence that so surely has thy Saviour come unto thee and implanted the gem of His life into thy soul; as surely as the consecrated bread is broken, and the wine poured out and presented unto thee, so surely mayst thou, struggling soul—thou who inquirest, whether the crucified one is also thy Saviour, and will dwell in thee—be assured that this Saviour has now in the use of the holy Sacraments, come unto thee anew! As the seal of a deed is a solemn token and pledge, that what is promised therein is truly given, so the Holy Sacraments sign and seal in the same manner, that that—which is promised in the most sacred deed of the saving Gospel—truly happens to those who, with longing faith, make use of the Holy Sacraments. In this way, through the penitent and believing grace and health-desiring use of the Holy Sacraments, will faith be strengthened and confirmed, not only that our confidence in our union with Christ increases, but rather that Christ Himself grows in us, that is, that the new-man in us receives new nourishment.*

And now, since our Saviour so lovingly has cared, and still cares for us, that to none of us shall be wanting anything that may conduce to our life and godly conduct (1 Pet. 1: 3); since He in His mercy and faithfulness has obtained eternal life for us, who are by nature dead in sins, and has redeemed us by His blood, and permits His Gospel to be proclaimed unto us, and extends to us His holy covenant—seals that through the operation of His spirit we may believe, and by faith receive Him through whom we have and enjoy salvation and life. Oh, let us at least not despise the riches of this grace and mercy. Consider well, that you have nothing that will comfort you in this life, or strengthen you in the conflict with the enemy of your souls, but faith in the Sa-

viour—nothing in death and the judgment but His atoning merits. Consider well, that if you have not true faith in this Saviour, you have no part in His life. Trifle not as, alas, so many do with regard to your faith. Oh, how sad is it that many live so carelessly herein, imagining that they have true faith, but have not the slightest reason for it; have not yet truly out of the depths called and prayed to the Holy Ghost who works this faith, and without whom no man can call Jesus a Saviour. How fearful when will it be made to appear to these—in death and the judgment, when the time of grace has expired, when they can no more use those means of grace—that their faith will not stand, is dead, unfruitful. Therefore examine yourselves often and earnestly, how it stands with your faith. Hear the saving Gospel with the best, holiest desires; use the Holy Supper penitently, and with hungering for grace. Hold fast with hearty prayer to the Holy Ghost. Do not suppose, when you once have faith, you need it no further. This faith must grow, for only so will you grow in holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

Surely, he cannot be a child of God who does not regard the dearest testament of his God and Saviour; he cannot love Jesus who does not keep his Commandments (John 1, 4: 10), hears not his Lord, does not show forth His death until He come. But hereon may, should, and will we confidently rely, that the Covenant of His grace never wavers; that the Lord will, in the day of the appearance of His glory, own those as His members who confess His word and Covenant-seal, and will glorify them, that they may be like Him, for they shall see Him as He is. Whereunto may the Lord in mercy help us. Amen.

---

#### THROUGH CHRIST.

THERE is nothing required of us by God, that reason and common sense do not tell us is right and good for our happiness. Is not the Mighty Maker of heaven and earth, the glorious Preserver of all things, and the gracious Benefactor of all creatures worthy of the best love of man? Is it not just and good to love our fellow-men as we love ourselves? Yes; it is just, right and good; it may be done. And if it were done, this would soon be a Paradise again—"the wilderness would blossom as a rose."



Let no one suppose that the law was only in force when man dwelt in Paradise and communed daily with his Creator, but is now abrogated as Christ came and died to fulfill it. Jesus obeyed the moral law and endured the penalty attached to its violation by dying on the cross; but He did so to make it honorable, not to abrogate it. It is not abolished. It cannot be abolished, not one jot or tittle of it. It is unchangeable as the great "I am" Himself. It is the expression of God's holy, righteous and unalterable will. It is, therefore, spiritual, for God is a spirit. Two things we must remember. Our internal man and also the external must conform to it. As the law is the expression of the Divine nature, so is the outward act of man the expression of the internal. No greater lie did the devil ever get men to believe than that the bad of some men is all outside and the heart within good. It is not true, but as heretodox as Satan can make it, to ensnare and deceive people. Men may by good acts, in imitation of the righteous in Christ, deceive us as to the true state of their hearts, to advance their personal interests, but they cannot deceive us by wicked acts. Bad acts are sure indicators of wrong hearts. As a rule, men act as they feel in the heart. But not to digress too much, we ask: Do you do all things demanded of you? Do you discharge your moral duties according to the law? What say you? Pause, and let conscience testify. How stands the matter with you? We know what God's word says: "There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." "For in many things we offend all." The whole world is guilty before God. (Rom. 3: 10, 12; Eccl. 7: 20; Rom. 3: 23; James 3: 2; Rom. 3: 19.) How clearly these passages of Scripture reveal to us our real state and condition according to nature, before God. We are taught the utter depravity of human nature—that all have sinned and that all fail to meet the demands of the law, so holy, so just, and so good. It must strike you very readily that you cannot by your own strength and ability comply with the requirements of the law. "What, then, can be done? What plan can human wisdom devise to escape the fearful consequences of sin? Can thine heart endure, or can thine hands be strong, in the days that I shall deal with thee. I, the Lord, have

spoken it, and will do it." That God "with whom is no variable-ness, neither shadow of turning," hath declared that sin shall be punished. We have sinned, grievously sinned, sinned every day and every hour and every minute of our entire lives; and hence, without help from on high, and help extended in a way that shall meet all the demands of the law, we must soon enter the world of the lost, "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." All things must be done or we perish.

*How can we do all things demanded?*

Through Christ. "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Not by ourselves, nor by anything that we can or by anything another mere creature can do for us. We are without strength to bring ourselves out of the estate of sin, guilt and misery. Our *help* and *strength* is in the Lord Jesus Christ. He did for us that which we could not do, that *in* Him, *through* Him, we can do it. Consider what He has done, and see how He is our sufficiency.

If man still dwelt in innocency he could do all things required by the law—he could obey to the honor and glory of God; but as he is in sin, sinful, helplessly sinful, he cannot. Another must obey and endure the penalty for him. Both were done by Jesus.

1. He obeyed the law to the letter, and in the full extent of the Spirit. He took the sinner's place. And during the whole time of His sojourn on earth; the law was the rule of His life. All His thoughts, all His feelings, all His words and all His acts, were in holy conformity to its requirements. He magnified the law by all His desires, sentiments, works, words and actions. And do not forget He did so under the severest temptations. It was not in a Paradise of beauty and purity, not in some distant realm of light and glory, but in the midst of the dreary ruins of sin. He was tempted as no man ever was tempted. Satan assailed Him, and man left nothing undone which a depraved and wicked heart could suggest to oppose Him. So great were His trials, that His soul was sorrowful unto death. But under all this He rendered perfect obedience to the law. It was not forced, but cheerful obedience—an obedience rendered out of love to God the Father and love to humanity so deeply fallen. And this should make Jesus lovely and glorious and precious and most estimable in the eyes of all men. His obedience was as extensive as the law itself.

In the words of Dr. Macfarlane, "It was perpetual—by night and by day—from childhood to manhood—in the scenes of social friendship, or amid the insults and cruelties of infatuated men—upon the top of the mountain, when all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them were offered to Him, and at the foot of the cross, when they gave Him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall."

But, *secondly*, He paid the penalty. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "Cursed is every one," etc. The penalty of the violated law is nothing less than death. Every man is under condemnation. Jesus takes the place of the sinner to suffer in his stead. As He rendered perfect obedience to all the requirements of the law and maintained its honor, so He also paid the penalty. "He became obedient unto death." "He died for us." He paid all our debts—satisfied the justice of God. As our surety he satisfied both the demands of the law and the justice of God. Mark it! He did it for us. "He hath given Himself for us, an offering and sacrifice unto God for a sweet smelling savor." He lived a life of sorrow and suffering and died for us. "He loved us and gave Himself for us." "He was wounded for our transgression;" "He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed." Oh think of all He did! Let it bring yon in great abasement to His feet. Our sins drove the nails that pierced His hands and feet. He died a shameful death. He was crucified. It was an excruciating death, especially so in this case, for He was just and holy. Nature shuddered at it. The sun concealed his face. The earth trembled from centre to circumference. The rocks broke their hearts. "The veil of the temple was rent from the top to the bottom. The graves were opened, and many of the bodies of the saints which slept, arose," and from the depth of the Saviour's agonizing heart came the last cry under the smiting rod of God's justice, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken Me." But hark! the Mediatorial work is done. The day of darkness is over. The hour of death has come. The exultant cry of triumph comes down to us through eighteen centuries, "It is finished! It is finished!" Jesus, the incarnate Son of God, died, but He died only to live again. On the third day He rose from the dead. He lives! He is an ever-living Saviour. "He ever liveth to make intercession for us."

He obeyed the law, overcame the world, conquered sin, death,



the grave and the devil. What all-glorious, majestic, matchless, all-powerful Saviour is He! "There is none other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved, but the name of Jesus." From all this we learn that our sufficiency to discharge our duties toward God and toward men is treasured in Jesus, God's crucified Son. He is our hiding place from the tempest of God's wrath against sin. If we look to Him as our Lord and our strength, we can do all things demanded—required—all things that it may please our Father to bring upon us to suffer for the true spiritual interest of the church. If we absolutely renounce ourselves, that He may be all in all, we can say: "Our life is hid with Christ in God." In Him alone can we do the works of righteousness—He did the work of saving merit. Out of Him all is dark and dreary. Out of Him we have misery and woe. Out of Him we are under the burning wrath of God. Out of Him there is no hope to enter heaven and enjoy rest. Out of Him we have hell on earth and hell throughout all eternity. Deliverance from the power of the devil, the remission of sin, acceptance as righteous by God, is all through CHRIST.

Do you ask where He is to be found? I believe He is everywhere, but I am sure, yes, confident, that you will find Him precious to your soul in His Word and in His true church. He is in the midst of the true Christian church, and there, by faith, every one can find Him. "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," is the promise to His people. All our sufficiency to do the works of righteousness is in Jesus. And so "sinful man becomes righteous through faith in Christ, and not through the law or any works of the law." By Christ, *in Christ*, THROUGH CHRIST.

"Crown Him forever, crown him King of kings;  
Crown Him forever, crown him Lord of lords;  
Crown Him the glorious Conqueror of Hell;  
Crown Him the everlasting Prince of Peace;  
Crown Him Jehovah, Jesus, Lamb of God,  
Hallelujah! Hallelujah! Amen."

---

LABOR AND WAIT.—There are two things that always pay. Working and waiting. Either is useless without the other. Both united are invincible and inevitably triumphant.

## SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

*Of the Ministers of the Church—Their Institution, and Their Duties.*

GOD has always made use of ministers for the gathering, founding, preserving and governing of His church; He still makes use of them, and will continue to do so, so long as the church is upon earth. Therefore, the origin, order and offices of the ministers is a most ancient ordinance, and comes from God Himself, and is not a new or human institution. True, God could by His power, without any means, collect His church from among men, but He will rather do it through men and the ministry or service of men. Consequently, those ministers are to be regarded as not merely ministers through themselves, but as ministers through whom God works the salvation of men. We must avoid so attributing to the secret working of the Holy Spirit, that which relates to our conversion and instruction, as thereby to make the office of the ministry superfluous. Rather we must ever be mindful of the words of the Apostle (Rom. 10: 14), "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? . . . So, then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." And also what the Lord says in the Gospel (John 13: 20), And what the man of Macedonia, whom Paul saw in a vision when he was in Asia, called out (Acts 16: 9), "Come over and help us." Now, at another place the Apostle tells us (1 Cor. 3: 9), "We are laborers together with God," &c. But, on the other side, we must take heed that we do not ascribe too much to the ministers and the office, mindful of the words of the Lord (John 6: 44), "No one cometh to me except the Father which hath sent me, draw Him." And also the words of the Apostle (1 Cor. 3: 5—7), "Who, then, is Paul," &c. Therefore, let us believe that God does teach us outwardly through his ministers, but inwardly He inclines the hearts of His elect to faith by the Holy Spirit; so that all the glory of this benefit belongs to God alone. Of this we have already spoken in the first chapter.

From the beginning of the world God made use of the most excellent men, (for although they were but simple as respects human

wisdom and philosophy, yet they were most excellent in respect to true knowledge of God), namely, the Patriarchs, with whom He often spake through angels. They were the prophets of their age, the preachers of faith, whom God had allowed to live for centuries that they might be fathers and lights of the world. After them came Moses and the world-renowned prophets. Then, after these, God sent His only-begotten Son to be the most perfect teacher of the world, in whom is hidden the divine wisdom, which flows to us by means of the most holy, most simple and most perfect doctrine, Col. 2: 3. He Himself chose disciples, whom He made Apostles; and they went into the whole world, everywhere gathering congregations through the preaching of the Gospel; afterward they ordained pastors and teachers in all the congregations, according to the commandment of Christ, by whose successors He has taught and ruled the church unto this day. Therefore, as God gave unto the ancient people the Patriarchs, Moses and the Prophets, so He sent His only-begotten Son, together with Apostles and Teachers, to the people of the New Testament.

Furthermore, the ministers of the new covenant have diverse names: Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Bishops, Elders, Pastors and Teachers. 1 Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 11. \* The Apostles had no definite places, but gathered congregations here and there in the world; when these churches were once established, they ceased to be Apostles, and each one entered as pastor into his congregation. The Prophets in the old time did foretell future events; but they also did interpret (secret) sense of the Scriptures. And such are found yet amongst us at the present day. Those were called Evangelists, who penned the Evangelical History, and they were also preachers of the Gospel; as we read, also, that Paul devolves upon Timothy to fulfill the work of an Evangelist. 2 Tim. 4: 5. But Bishops are the overseers and watchmen of the church, who attend to the support and other necessities of the church. The Elders are the old men, as it were, senators and fathers of the church, who govern it with wholesome counsels. The Pastors watch over the Lord's flock, and care for its needs. The Teachers instruct and teach true faith and piety. Therefore the ministers of the church that are now, we may name Bishops, Elders, Pastors and Teachers, (or Doctors.) Luke 6: 13; Acts 13: 1; 14: 23; 20: 28; 1 Cor. 12: 28; Eph. 4: 11.

But in process of time many more names were given to minis-



ters of the church: Patriarchs, Archbishops, Suffragans, Metropolitans, Archdeacons, Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorcists, Choristers, Porters, and who knows what other names; also Cardinals, Provosts, Priors, Patres Minores and Majores, higher and lower orders. But as regards these, we have troubled ourselves but little as to what they may once have been or are now. Sufficient for us in the Apostolical doctrine of the ministers.

As we are certain that Monks, and orders of Monks or Sects, were neither instituted of Christ nor the Apostles, we teach that such are of no benefit to the church, but rather an injury. For although they once were to be tolerated, (when they lived solitary, and were burdens once to no one, getting their living with their own hands, and were at the same time obedient to their pastors as laymen), yet now all the world sees and knows what they are. They pretend who knows what sort of vows, and lead a life entirely the opposite of their vows; so that the best of them must be reckoned to them of whom the Apostle speaks, in 2 Thes. 3: 11. Of such we have none in our church, and teach that they ought not to be tolerated in the church of Christ.

But no one ought to abuse the churchly office, namely, to draw it to himself by means of bribes, or other evil shifts, or his own willfulness. The ministers of the church must be chosen and called by a lawful election of the church. That is, they are to be elected by the congregation, or by the deputies chosen for this purpose out of the congregation; and that in due order, without tumult, disturbance or strife. Heb. 5: 4.

But not each and every one should be elected—but men that are fit; that have a correct knowledge, especially of the Scriptures; of Godly eloquence, of wise simplicity; such as are of good report for moderation and honesty of life, according to the Apostolic rule, in 1 Tim. 3. 2—7; Titus 1: 5, 6. And those who are thus chosen, are to be ordained of the Elders with public prayer and the laying on of hands.

We, therefore, reject all who act as ministers of their own accord; being neither elected, nor sent, nor ordained. We disapprove of unfit ministers, and such as are not furnished with the requisite gifts. And yet we acknowledge that the simplicity of certain pastors of the ancient church was without injury, nay, sometimes more useful than the manifold, carefully polished, but rather puffed-up learning of others. Therefore, we do not reject at the

present day, also the pious simplicity of some who are not destitute of experience. Jer. 23: 21.

The Apostles do, indeed, call all believers priests, but not in respect to the office, but because through Christ all believers can offer spiritual sacrifices to God as kings and priests. The priesthood and the ministry of the church, are things far different one from the other. The former is common to all Christians, as we said above; the latter is not. We have not destroyed the office of the ministry, because we put away the Papistic priesthood. Ex. 19: 6; 1 Pet. 2: 9; Rev. 1: 6.

For in the new covenant there is no longer a priesthood as in the old, which has the outward anointing, sacred vestments, and manifold ceremonies, which were once figures and types of Christ. All such He fulfilled and abolished by His coming. Heb. 9: 10, 11. He alone remains the only Priest forever; and that we may not detract anything from Him, we give the name of priest to no minister of the church. For He himself, the Lord, nowhere in the church of the New Testament, ordained any priests who, having received authority from a suffragan bishop, should daily make an offering, namely, of the body and blood of the Lord, for the living and the dead; but such (ministers) who shall teach and administer the holy Sacraments. Paul (in 1 Cor. 4: 1), tells us briefly and simply how we are to think of ministers of the church of Christ. "*Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.*" Consequently, it is the will of the Apostle that we should regard the ministers of the church as servants. He calls them *υπερετας* (under-rowers) which have an eye only to the pilot, men who live not for themselves, nor according to their own will, but are entirely dependent upon the will of another, namely, their Master.

For it is the duty of the minister of the church, wholly and in all things, not to follow his own will, but only to do *that* which has been commanded him by the Lord. The passage quoted, expressly declares who is our Master, namely, Christ; and the ministers are in subjection to Him in all functions of the office.

And in order that he might fully declare in what the office consists, the Apostle yet adds, that the ministers are stewards or dispensers of the mysteries of God, 1 Cor 4: 1. In many places, especially in Eph. 3: 9, the Gospel of Christ is called a mystery. The Sacraments also, were in ancient times called mysteries. Hence, the

the ministers of the church are called for this to preach the Gospel to believers, and to administer the Sacraments. Besides this, we also read, in the Gospel of the faithful and wise servant, that the Lord set him over His family to give food unto it in due season. Luke 12 : 42. Again, a man went into a far country, called his servants, committed to them his substance, and appointed to every man his work. Luke 12 ; Matt. 25.

This is now a proper place to add something also in respect to the powers and duties of the ministers of the church. Concerning this power, some have disputed very busily, and would subject to their power, in a sum, everything that is upon the earth, contrary, however, to the command of the Lord, who forbids *all lordship* to His disciples, and above all, commends humility. Matt. 18 : 1—4 ; 20 : 25 ; Luke 22 : 25, 26.

There is, in truth, a purely absolute power existing, of right. According to this kind of power, all things are put in subjection to Christ, the Lord of all, as He himself testifies. Matt. 28 : 18 ; Rev. 1 : 17, 18 ; Rev. 3 : 7. This power the Lord reserves to Himself, and transfers it to no one else, that He might sit idly by as a spectator of His working minister. In Isa. 22 : 22, we are told, "And the key of the house of David will I lay upon *his* shoulder;" and Isa. 9 : 6, "And the government shall be upon *his* shoulder." This government he does not lay upon the shoulders of another, but He keeps and uses His own power, and rules all things.

Quite a different power is that of the office of ministry, which is limited by Him who has all power. This is far more like a service than a lordship. For the Master does, indeed, give to a steward power in His house ; for this purpose He commits to him the key, that he may admit or exclude such whom the Master will have admitted or excluded. According to this power, the servant does from duty that which the Master has commanded him ; and the Master confirms what His servant has done, and will, therefore, have it honored and acknowledged as His own. To this subject belong the sayings of the Gospel, in Matt. 16 : 19 ; John 20 : 23. But if the servant does not deal in all things according to the command of the Master, but pass the limits of faithfulness, then, surely, that which he does, will be rejected of the Lord. Consequently, the spiritual power of the ministers, is that official activity whereby they do, indeed, govern the church, but yet do all things in the church as the Lord has prescribed them in His



Word. If this has been done, believers should acknowledge it as the Lord's own work. Of the office of the keys, we have spoken somewhat before.

But to all ministers in the church there is given one and the same power or function. Certainly, in the beginning, the bishops or elders governed the church in common; no one elevated himself above another, or assumed a greater authority or power over his fellow elders. Remembering the words of the Lord (Luke 22 : 26), "He that is chief among you, let him be as he that doth serve." They maintained themselves in humility and mutually aided one another in the government of the church. But to preserve order, one of the ministers called the assembly together, and in the assembly propounded the subjects to be discussed, gathered the votes of the remainder, and took care that no confusion did arise. So we read concerning the Apostle Peter (Acts 15 : 7), who yet for all that was not set over the rest, or endowed with greater authority. Very correctly does Cyprian, the Martyr, say, "That the rest of the Apostles were what Peter was, having an equal fellowship, honor and power; but the beginning starts from one, in order that the assembly may show itself as one." Jerome says something similar in his Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to Titus. Before that, by the instigation of the devil, there arose parties in religion, *the churches were governed by the common counsel of the elders*. But after that, each one regarded those as his own, whom he had baptized, and not as Christ's; it was decreed that one of the elders should be chosen and set over the rest, who should have the care of the whole church laid upon him, so that all seeds of schisms might be removed. But Jerome did not regard this decree as divine, for soon after he adds thereto: "The elders know that by the custom of the church they are subject to those set over them; so should the bishops also know that they are placed over the elders more by custom than by the prescription of the divine truth, and that they ought to govern the church in common with them." Thus Jerome: and hence no one can, of right, prevent that we should return to the old order of the church of God, preferring it to human custom.

The duties of the minister are manifold; but can be reduced to two, which include all the others, namely, to the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and the right administration of the Sacraments. It is the duty of the ministers to gather together the congregation,

to interpret the Word of God therein, and to apply the whole doctrine to the state and use of the congregation, to the end that what is taught may benefit the hearers and edify believers. Further, they are to instruct the inexperienced ; to exhort, and, indeed, to urge the lingering and the sleepy to progress in the way of the Lord ; to comfort and strengthen the faint-hearted, and to arm them against the temptations of the devil ; to punish offenders ; to bring back the erring ; to raise up the fallen ; to convince gainsayers ; to drive away the wolves from the flesh of the Lord ; wisely and earnestly to rebuke vice and wicked men, and not to wink at or pass over grievous offences.

But it is also the duty of ministers to administer the Sacraments ; to commend their proper use, and to prepare all by wholesome doctrine, to receive them in the proper manner. Further, to keep all believers in holy unity, and to prevent divisions ; and, also, to catechise the inexperienced ; to commend the needs of the poor of the congregation ; to visit the sick and the tempted, in order to instruct them and keep them in the way of life. And, finally, to provide for public prayers and supplications in time of need, with fasting, that is, a holy abstinence ; and, indeed, to take care most diligently in regard to everything which belongs to the peace, rest and safety of the church. 1 Cor. 14 ; Zech. 34 ; Titus 1 : 9.

And seeing that there must be a discipline in the church, and since among the fathers excommunication was in use, and there were spiritual courts with the people of God, by which this discipline was applied through wise and pious men, therefore, it also belongs to the ministers to exercise this discipline, according to the condition of the age, the public circumstances, and according to necessity. In doing which, it is to be observed as a rule, that all things be done decently, honestly, without lordship or tumult (2 Cor. 10 : 8), for the Apostle says that power was given to him of God unto edification, and not to destroy. And the Lord Himself has forbidden to pluck up the tares in His field, if there be danger that the wheat be plucked up with it. Matt. 13 : 29.

Besides, we condemn hereby the error of the Donatists, who regard the Word and Sacraments as effectual or non-effectual, according to the good or evil life of the minister. We remember, that in Matt. 23 : 3, the Lord Himself has said, that we must have respect to the Word, even when it comes from evil ministers. We know that the Sacraments are sanctified through their institution

and the Word of Christ, and are effectual for the pious, even when they are administered by ungodly ministers. On this account Augustine, the blessed servant of God, strongly opposed the Donatists.

But not the less ought there to be a strict discipline as regards the ministers. On the Synods a diligent investigation ought to be had in respect to their doctrine and life. The erring ones, where they are yet capable of recovery, must be put right by the seniors, or else where there is no hope of recovery, deposed and separated from true pastors, like as wolves from the flock of Christ. If they are errorists, they are in no wise to be tolerated.

We do not condemn the general councils, if they are held according to the example of the Apostles, for the welfare of the church, and not for its injury.

All faithful ministers are also worthy of their reward, as good workmen, and do not sin when they receive their support, and such things as are necessary for themselves and their families. For the Apostle shows that these things are rightfully given by the congregation, and received by the ministers. 1 Cor. 9:9; 1 Tim. 5:18. The Anabaptists are also confuted by the Apostolical doctrine, who condemn and rail at those ministers who live from their offices.

---

#### THE POWERS OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

In the *Messenger* of April 2d, a correspondent, whom we take to be Elder Zahm, of Lancaster, puts forth a theory of the General Synod and its powers, which we regard as fundamentally erroneous. The theory is, however, a rather ingenious one, and plausible enough at a first view. It is not very difficult to see why this theory has been invented, and why it is favored by the Mercersburg party. They have so long been advocating absolute subjection to ecclesiastical authority, that they do not like to admit that General Synod has any authority of any consequence; especially since General Synod has deliberately decided contrary to their views, on two important points, and may possibly do so again in the future, even on doctrinal points. Hence, the various attempts



made at the General Synod so to change its Constitution that it should virtually be displaced from its position as the "Supreme judicatory." But inasmuch as no success was met in this, Elder Zahm has reached the same end by a shorter path: he denies the supreme authority of the General Synod in the constitution as we now have it.

His theory is the following, in substance: The General Synod is a body that has been formed by a sort of compact between several perfectly independent Synods; these latter Synods (the District Synods, as they are now called), have retained most of their powers; within this circle of jurisdiction, their power is absolute and final. Only certain specified powers have been delegated to the General Synod; this can only exercise its jurisdiction in such cases and under such conditions as are specified in the Constitution; it has no power even to interpret the organic law, except in so far as this law applies to the cases or points which come before it for final adjudication under the conditions which he names. The practical effect of the whole theory is, that the Constitution of the church is really and may be called "two Constitutions," namely, "the Constitution of the General Synod, and the Constitution of the Synods or Synod. That part of it which relates to the General Synod, defining its powers and functions, is properly the Constitution of the *whole* church, while all the rest is properly the Constitution of the several Synods."

Consequently, the only powers, according to this theory, which the General Synod possesses, are:

1. General Synod is the last resort in all cases respecting *government*; but only in those cases *not finally adjudicated by the Synods*.
2. The General Synod may approve or disapprove of the acts of the Synods; but except in a small class of cases, this is only a moral act, and has only moral influence.
3. The General Synod has jurisdiction over "ordinances," (i. e. Liturgies, Catechisms, Hymn Books, and amendments to the Constitution.)
4. Also of matters relating to the whole church, as controversies between Synods, &c.
5. Of Home and Foreign Missions.
6. Of making new Synods.

"These," (he says,) are *all the delegated powers* of the General

Synod, *and beyond these it dare not go*, without treading upon the *reserved* rights and prerogatives of the Synods. On every other point, except those enumerated, the Synods are independent, and fully competent to act for themselves as they may deem best."

The following are *fundamental errors*, and fatal ones, in this theory :

1. It regards the Constitution of the General Synod as a compact between the independent Synods, in which the latter have reserved most of their powers, and have delegated to the General Synod only a limited and narrow circle of powers. This is, in fact, quite the same theory in the religious sphere, which for years met us in the political sphere in relation to the nature of the Constitution in this nation. In the latter case, the theory has been repudiated by the judicial and other authorities of the State, and very generally by the nation. It has a still more slender foundation on which to stand, as respects our Church Constitution.

For, as a matter of history, the Constitution of the church in its present form, was not made as a compact between the Synods; nor did the Synods delegate certain powers to the General Synod, reserving others. But the Synods only prepared the document or scheme; the act of establishing the Constitution and assigning the different powers, was the act of the church at large. *It was the Classes who adopted and established the Constitution*, and the Classes in thus giving it force and authority, *acted as the representatives of the congregations.* (See Article 47.)

This is a fundamental point, entirely overlooked by this theory. The independent Synods had no right or authority to make such a compact; the church had never granted them that power; and, in fact, they did not pretend to exercise it. *All ecclesiastical power in the Reformed church roots in, and grows forth, from the congregations*; a point which was so ably brought out at the last General Synod by Prof. Greding, and which our Constitution itself so plainly recognizes.

2. A second fundamental error consists in this, that Elder Zahm regards only Articles 77—84, as defining the powers and prerogatives of the General Synod; and thus, (with Article 144), forming the Constitution of the General Synod; whilst all the rest is the Constitution of the Synods or Synod.

He seems to have entirely overlooked Articles 23—38. *These, be it remembered, are expressly made to apply to the General Synod,*

and confer upon that body "supreme jurisdiction," subject only to the Word of God. We are here informed (in Article 23), that there are four ecclesiastical judicatories :

1. The Consistory.
2. The Classis.
3. The Synod.
4. THE GENERAL SYNOD.

That is, the congregations, or the church at large, have established four successive judicatories, rising one above the other in an ascending grade ; and all the articles in this chapter are just as true of, and apply as well, according to circumstances, to the General Synod as to District Synods or Classes. For example, the right of determining appeals or complaints on any proper subject, and in proper order, is just as much granted to the General Synod as to any other judicatory. According to Article 29, any person who thinks himself aggrieved by a decision of a Synod, has the right of appeal to the General Synod, and the subjects or matters concerning which he may appeal, are not limited by the Constitution. The Articles 77—84, are no *limitation* upon the judicial and legislative powers of the General Synod, as Mr. Zahm falsely supposes ; they are much more a limitation upon the powers of the District Synods, since in regard to those matters the jurisdiction is *exclusively* vested in the General Synod. There are a few matters (such as the government of theological seminaries, founded by them), in regard to which the District Synods have exclusive jurisdiction, and these, *and these only*, are a limitation of the powers of the supreme judicatory. The General Synod is here (Article 23), put in the regular order of ascending judicatories, and made the highest and ultimate judge ; not merely in respect to Hymn Books, &c., but in regard to all ecclesiastical matters.

3. And this brings us directly to the third fundamental error in the theory. The interpretation which he labors to give to Article 77, *will not hold*. This is as follows : "Article 77. The General Synod represents the whole church. *It is the highest judicatory of the church*, and the last resort in all cases representing the government of the church, not finally adjudicated by the Synods." He takes the words, "last resort in all cases respecting the government of the church," in too narrow a sense, as though it pertained only to discipline, and a very limited circle of subjects.

But, according to Reformed theory and practice, the "govern-



ment of the church" includes a very wide circle of powers. It includes the defining of doctrines and heresies, the ordering of worship, and the correction of errors in the mode of worship; the deciding of what the Constitution means, *in all cases*, (even decisions in regard to questions of order in District Synods, according to Mr. Zahm's votes in the last General Synod); and, in fact, the final decision of all questions, (whether relating to doctrine, discipline, cultus, or government) regularly brought before it, as the fourth and highest court and assembly of the church. All this is included already in the 77th Article itself, as well as in the Articles 23—38.

The truth is, that upon the adoption by the representatives of the congregations, of the present Constitution, the General Synod took the place which the Synods formerly occupied, in the order of courts; it is the highest and supreme judicatory; only certain powers were conferred exclusively upon the District Synods, as such, in the new system. It is quite true, that the General Synod "is a body of delegated powers," but so, also, are all the Synods. What powers they severally have, have been delegated to them by the church at large. We quite agree with Elder Zahm, that the Constitution should be construed strictly, and that the General Synod should not encroach on the powers and jurisdiction of the Synods. But it is equally true, that the Synods, or *the Synod*, should not encroach on the powers and jurisdiction of the General Synod; for this is the *highest* court, and the last resort in all cases respecting the government of the church "not finally adjudicated by the Synods." This last clause has a very simple sense and force. A majority of cases are finally disposed of by the Synods; all parties are satisfied. But, when no such final adjudication has been reached, the General Synod stands open as the "highest court" and "last resort."

This was also the intention of the church, when the General Synod was formed. *It was not a compact between two Synods, but an organic union of the whole church.* Elder Zahm has not read the history of that movement correctly. J. H. G.

---

THE facts that the old Greeks use to laugh over the same good jokes that we do, leads Dr. Hopkins to remark that "Irish bulls were once calves in Greece."

## THE LANCASTER OVATION.

(Second Article.)

As shown in our former article, the Dr. Nevin birth-day *ovation*, (so-called), is invested with special significance in having been made an occasion, not merely of personal congratulations, but of partisan addresses. These addresses are chiefly occupied with statements and assertions, which set forth the leading principles, plans and aims of the new theology party, or Nevinism party, or Nevinism, in a way serving fully to confirm the truth of the charges brought against it, as contrary to the faith and life of the Reformed church, and as subversive of that life and faith.

Duly to appreciate the force of the addresses of Drs. Nevin and Gerhart in this respect, and the chief points we are gathering from them,

*Let it be Remembered,*

1. That these gentlemen are to be regarded as having spoken *in a representative capacity*. The peculiar sentiments they uttered, are sentiments of their party. It is fair and just, therefore, to hold the party responsible for the admissions made, the views advanced, and the purposes or plans avowed.

2. It must further be borne in mind, that notwithstanding the repeated avowal of similar sentiments and purposes, and the manifest inconsistency of them with fidelity to the faith and life of the church, some of those who have written or spoken for the party and its revolutionary movements, have stoutly denied that any views were held, or any scheme favored, which was materially at variance with the historical faith and character of the Reformed church. They have, also, indignantly repudiated charges brought against them, of holding and teaching things contrary to our Reformed doctrine and practice, and have even sought, by foul means, to bring those making such charges, under ecclesiastical censure, and to drive them from the church.

3. In the next place, it should be remembered that these addresses were made shortly *after the failure of the party's attempt* to crush out opposition in the East to their anti-Reformed and Romanizing views and schemes, after its defeat at the last General Synod, and in the face of the many apostasies to Popery and

high-church Episcopacy for which Nevinism is fearfully responsible.

4. And, finally, it must be remembered, that just at this time the party is making most strenuous efforts to counteract and neutralize the effects of the action of the General Synod to concentrate and strengthen its forces, and to inaugurate methods for promoting its objects and securing ultimate success.

All this renders it exceedingly desirable to know certainly, and from its own declarations, what Nevinism means, what it aims at, and how it hopes finally to prevail. Happily for the cause of truth, the addresses shed light on all these points. In the exuberance of the joy felt on the interesting occasion, the inmost heart of one of the speakers, especially the more frank and less studiously cautious of the two, overflowed in utterances sufficiently plain, for once, to be easily understood. For the sake of truth and the church, we may be glad that this has been done. Doubtless, it would be better for all concerned, if the leaders of the Mercersburg-Lancaster school of theology, had remained loyal to the principles and faith of the Reformed church, and had devoted their time and whatever talents they may possess, to the maintenance and advancement of that faith. But, as they have felt impelled (no doubt conscientiously) to a contrary course, it is well that the fact and extent of their revolutionizing movement should be known. And the best testimony on a point like this is, that which "proceeds out of their own mouth."

From this testimony, as furnished in the addresses, two facts or admissions have already been obtained:

1. Nevinism is acknowledged to be a movement or scheme distinctive from the historical faith and life of the Reformed church.
2. The scheme or movement concerns principles and doctrines which are fundamental in their character.

We proceed now to show, by evidence from the same addresses, and closely related sources, that

*Those fundamental principles of Nevinism involve a material and essential change in the faith and practice (cultus) of the Reformed church.*

This is conceded by necessary implication in what is said in the addresses regarding the revival of "faith in the objective reality of the Christian revelation," by the so-called "positive teaching" of Dr. Nevin, and of faith "in the supernatural Constitu-



tion of the church." These phrases, it will be noted, occur in the cautiously expressed generalities of Dr. Gerhart's address. But, any one acquainted with the literature of the Mercersburg school, such as it is, knows well what such phraseology really means.

All the distinctive teaching of the Mercersburg party, has directly concerned and affected the vital, fundamental doctrines and devout usages of the church. The *positive*\* character claimed for the theology of the party, has consisted mainly, if not exclusively, in its *denials* of some of those very articles of faith for which, on the authority of Jesus Christ and His Word, the Reformed church has, from the first, contended most earnestly. Take some examples :

In answer to the question : Why did the Word (Logos) become flesh (Cur Deus Homo?) the Reformed church, like the primitive Apostolic, has declared, in order that His human nature, sustained by union with the divine nature, might render full satisfaction for sin, and so secure for us righteousness and eternal life.

Nevinism denies this, or sets it aside, and asserts that the great ruling purpose of the incarnation, was to effect an "organic conjunction of the Godhead with human nature, generically, in order, by this method, to secure the redemption of the race." If this is *positive* theology in distinction from that of the Reformed church, it is so chiefly in being *positively* at variance with the latter. Besides differing materially and essentially from the faith of the church on this particular point, it involves inferences which contradict that faith on all other vital points.

Take another fundamental doctrine, that of *justification by faith*. Its vital importance in the Christian system is strongly emphasized in all the leading confessions of the Reformed church, and in its entire theology. Nowhere could a doctrine be more clearly or explicitly avowed, than is this doctrine in the answer to the 60th Question of the Heidelberg Catechism. The substance of what it teaches is, that penitent sinners obtain a justifying and saving personal interest in Christ, by having His perfect salvation, righteousness and holiness imputed to them, so that the benefits thereof become really theirs, because they embrace Him and His

---

\*There is a ridiculous inconsistency in a school which has spent its energies for years in assailing, neglecting, and trying to pull down the old faith of Evangelical Protestantism, loudly claiming to be positive in its theology.

benefits with a believing heart, and this *because they cannot receive and apply the same (benefits) to themselves in any other way than by faith only.* (Ques. 61.)

Nevinism, still pressing its theory of an organic conjunction of the Godhead with humanity, teaches that so far as any such doctrine as justification holds, the sinner is made righteous before God by an actual conveyance or transmission of the righteousness of Christ in, with, and under a conveyance of the very substance of His glorified theanthropic nature, over to the sinner. The channel and means of this conveyance, is primarily baptism.

Other equally significant illustrations might be drawn from the essential difference, and even antagonism between the faith of the Reformed church in regard to regeneration, the Sacraments in general, the believer's union with Christ, the church, &c., &c. But the above instances must suffice.

Now, all this, according to Dr. Gerhart, constitutes the distinctively positive teaching of the school for which he spoke. And to all that Dr. Gerhart thus assumed and asserted, Dr. Nevin said, Amen.

The same radical difference holds between Reformed principles of *worship*, and the tenets and practice of Nevinism. This has been so often pointed out and proven, that it need not be demonstrated anew.

Summing all up, then, into one sentence, on this point, we may assert that, according to the statements and admissions of leading men of the party, the introduction of Nevinism into the Reformed church, would make the church radically different in fundamental doctrines, and in the principles and forms of worship.

Here, now, the addresses at the ovation furnish testimony touching another point of great significance :

*Such a revolution of the faith and practice of the Reformed church was involved in the conception and scheme of the Nevinite movement from the start.*

How far this was done consciously, on the part of the leaders of the movement, and with the forethought of a definitely formed plan, is not for us to determine. Some facts connected with it seem to indicate what has been affirmed, that there was no such premeditated purpose, but that those leading the movement were simply caught by a current which swept by them, and by its strong force carried them along they knew not whither. This is possible.

It is, however, not very credible, or creditable to the faith and stability of those who seek in this way to explain or excuse their driftings. Only things lying loosely along the banks, or trees slightly rooted, or from whose roots successive floods have washed away the supporting soil, are apt to be so swept off by the swollen stream and carried down with it in its course. If men chosen to be official teachers of theology, in a special, technical sense, show themselves to be no more firmly fixed in the faith than this, what are *mere* ministers of the Gospel, and, above all, what are the poor, common people, to do? Might it not be better, in view of such a peril, for the church not to raise such tall sycamores, than to risk the evil consequences of their fall, and so increase the power of the rushing waters to do harm?

But let the addresses speak on this point. Here we have, first, Dr. Gerhart in his laudatory remarks (of some of the characteristics of which, as said before, we do not care to speak), assuming throughout that the peculiar theology and scheme for and of which he was speaking, started consciously more than twenty years ago. He refers definitely to the time when, by the assertion of what he chooses to call "a positive faith," Dr. Nevin "became involved in conflicts and controversy, and (*he is sorry to say*) subjected him to no little misrepresentation and abuse, both abroad and at home."\*

In full accord with this assumption of Dr. Gerhart, we find Dr. Nevin asserting that the commencement of his peculiar work and mission, may be traced far back to his days in Mercersburg. Thus, he says: "It has been our privilege to give a mighty evidence to truth, and particularly to truth of the more fundamental kind. This evidence was given in great weakness *at that little, insignificant village of Mercersburg*, at the foot of a mountain. And now, *looking back in this way*, the Seminary, (of which Dr. Nevin was then the theological professor), has reason *to rejoice in what it has*

---

\*Was Dr. Gerhart among those who were guilty of this alleged wrong? Did he, while Professor at Tiffin, ever say that the tendency of some things then taught at Mercersburg, was Romish? But how strange that men who have been playing Ishmaelites against almost the entire Evangelical Protestantism of America, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Puritans, and Methodists in turn, should wail out such complaints. It would be hard to find in the whole field of American theological controversy, misrepresentations as grossly unjust, or abuse as uncharitably bitter, as have been indulged by Dr. Nevin and some of his more zealous adherents. If every man's hand has turned against them, it should be remembered that their hand in the first place was turned against every man, unless he was a Papist or a Puseyite.



*accomplished. Our church movement* has been a great movement in the history of our Christianity."

From such remarks, taken as they must be, in connection with all the known facts of the case, it is undeniable that the Nevinite movement involved from the start, the unhappy developments to which it has led. If Dr. Nevin, and others sustaining more confidential relations to him, did not contemplate or intend such developments, they must be less intelligent and thoughtful than they claim to be, or than the most ordinary men, enjoying their advantages and occupying any like position, are commonly found to be. But, Dr. Nevin himself disclaims any such lack of foresight and plan, when he says, with evident emotion, "I feel thankful that my life has been SPARED TO ACCOMPLISH THAT ON WHICH MY HEART HAS BEEN SET FROM THE BEGINNING. \* \* \* If I had been *called away before I saw* OUR PRINCIPLES ESTABLISHED, and before I had sent out men to defend their truth, it would have been felt *that all was to run out into the sand.*"

Whatever else this may mean, it clearly does signify and assert:

1. That Nevinism, from its *departure* in 1847-50, did consciously start out on new distinctive principles, differing from those of the antecedent and prevailing theology of the Reformed church.
2. That these peculiar principles were, in the first instance, lodged in and bound up with Dr. Nevin's own personal thinking, notions, and designs.
3. That it took some time to get them established.
4. That to secure, effectively, their establishment, certain men, (we suppose he means the young men, that is, the students under his tuition), were diligently indoctrinated with these peculiar principles.
5. That further to promote this work, those men were sent out on the special mission of propagating those principles.
- And 6. That all this was so *organically* linked in with Dr. Nevin's personality, so rooted in his own life, that had he been called away in the *first period* of the work, it would have perished, principles and all.

Admissions and declarations like these, would be significant at any time. They reveal what most intimately concerns all to whom the old principles and faith of the Reformed church are dear, and what can hardly fail deeply to move the hearts of all who have any zeal for the maintenance of those principles and that faith. They show that the great animating spirit of the movement in question, was not love for the doctrines of the church as set forth

in her standards (see Article 19 of the Constitution), but a predominate desire and purpose to inculcate, establish, and disseminate certain peculiar principles of its own.

It does not relieve the unpleasant features, in this view of the movement, to pretend or claim now (as an afterthought engendered by policy), that those new principles were not antagonistic to the Reformed faith, but simply a development of them. There are ample grounds for denying this claim, and abundant means for refuting it. To develop Reformed principles into some of the distinctive doctrines of Popery, or ultra-Lutheranism, is to abandon those principles and cast them overboard. Our Reformed faith is a living one, and admits of development. But substituting Nevinite principles, so-called, for it, is not a development of that faith; it is its subversion. It runs a whole quadrant another way. The distinctive tenets of Nevinism are, (with the exception of its pantheising view of the incarnation, which was wholly unknown to our Reformed fathers), tenets which have been repeatedly exposed, opposed, and denounced as errors, by Reformed Confessions and standard Reformed theologians. And the leaders of the movement are less intelligent theologians than they are generally thought to be, if they do not know this. But what they do, partly at least, know, it seems evident from the tortuous attempts which some of them have made, to show that their doctrines are not antagonistic to the established faith of the Reformed church. This, moreover, is impliedly admitted by a remarkable statement of Dr. T. G. Apple, in an article in the *Messenger*, defending Mr. Rupp's view of regeneration. He says, as a sort of finality, that if Mr. Rupp's view of baptismal regeneration were contrary to the Heidelberg Catechism, it might be unfortunate, "*yet, if it is according to the New Testament, we should think that would be sufficient.*" This means that Nevinism claims the right of teaching what it pleases, if it can defend such teaching by its interpretation of the New Testament. By this rule there is not a doctrine of the Reformed church which it could not set aside.

Another point brought out in these Lancaster addresses is—

*That the new-order movement, with all it involves, has been persistently pressed onward to the present time.*

All the appliances and opportunities at its command have been used and directed with combined and undeviating energy to this

end. The one ruling aim and constant endeavor, has been to get "the church committed to this (new) order of thought." In proof of this, the quotations already made, may be appealed to as sufficient. But it is applied and assumed in the entire tenor and spirit of both addresses.

Furthermore, we learn from the addresses, that—

*The party as now concentrated and represented at Lancaster, is in full accord with this scheme, principles and all, and is more determined than ever to labor and contend for its final triumph.*

There is no change, no modification of the tenets proclaimed twenty years ago. Lancaster has inherited its theology from Mercersburg. It is pledged to carry it out faithfully, and at all hazards. Some recent experiences may teach the leaders to be more wary in their utterances. They may try to forget, and persuade others to forget, that Nevinism has confessed itself to be not Reformed. They may direct their efforts to making out the semblance of harmony, even between its peculiar views and Reformed principles. Dr. Apple will, perhaps, write articles ignoring his concessions to the ultra-Lutheran, Professor Fritschel, in regard to the Sacraments, and very boldly contend now, that the doctrines of his school are "not in contradiction with the Heidelberg Catechism." Such a policy is almost forced upon the party, since it has found the church waking up to some due sense of the situation. But whatever specious attempts of this sort may be made, the significant fact remains, that *Lancaster* is simply Mercersburg, driven, as it were, from its former ground "at the foot of the mountain," out into a more open country.

Those brethren, therefore, who have been hoping and flattering their hearts with the expectation that there would be now some desirable chance in favor of the old Reformed faith, some retracing of steps from the dangerous paths into which Mercersburg-Nevinism had run, must feel that they have been sadly deceived. Lancaster is committed, head and heart, to all that went before, and has pledged all its powers to the work of carrying out what was begun twenty or more years ago.

This will suffice, regarding points actually revealed in the ovation addresses. It would be interesting and instructive, also, to note some *things* very significantly *omitted* in these addresses. For instance, one misses all allusion to some of the bitter fruits of the highly lauded "new-order of thought" and "fundamental prin-



ciples" of the "great movement." Dr. Gerhart remembered the "personal abuse," as he calls it, and Dr. Nevin the "brutal assaults" made, as he says, upon him.

But neither Dr. Gerhart nor Dr. Nevin saw fit to remember that such abuse and assaults originated with their own side, and were made by them in more violent and bitter forms than were ever retaliated.

Neither Dr. Gerhart nor Dr. Nevin remembered, or seems to have remembered, the scores of apostasies to Popery for which their "new-order of thought" is justly held responsible. Why were not Stewart, and J. H. Wagner, and J. S. Ermentrout, and G. S. Wolff, and S. H. Giesy, and young Zahner, and Professor Budd, and others whom we forbear to name, present at the ovation? Where were they on that memorable occasion? Did not the distinguished speakers even think of them?

No allusion was made either to the sad dissensions and distractions in the church at large, for which the "new-order" attempt to revolutionize her, in principle and practice, is no less responsible.

No allusion was made to the serious losses the church has sustained in many congregations, of scores of members, through the same pernicious influence.

No allusion is made in the addresses to the blighting effect of Nevinism upon many of the most important operations of the church.

All such things are passed over in silence. Nothing is heard but the vaunted praises of the marvellous movement, claimed to be the great re-Reformation of the 19th century. But what was forgotten in the addresses, is remembered elsewhere. And the day of reckoning, sure to overtake the "great movement" in due time, will show that it has not been forgotten. A chronometer, not of gold and precious jewels, not moved by springs of steel most refined, but one of far better material, and moved by far higher forces, is marking that time with unerring accuracy. Error, by its specious arts, may triumph for a moon, but the great sun rules the seasons; and these will in the end vindicate the truth and the right, when error lies withering among the fallen leaves of winter.

We have said years ago, what may be reiterated again, that we do not believe that the Reformed church was preserved for more than three centuries in its Apostolic faith, to be now subverted, or

betrayed back into the bondage of Popish errors, by such a movement as is found boastfully magnifying its own grandeur in the almost sickening self-laudations of these Lancaster addresses.

In conclusion we may add, that whilst we sincerely regret that such sentiments and purposes as are avowed in these addresses are entertained, we are thankful, that being entertained, they have been so freely proclaimed. Now, all may know what is to be expected from Lancaster. And knowing it, it will be their own fault if they are not prepared to meet the coming events which have been so strongly foreshadowed.

---

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

*Fifth Annual Report.*

THE Fifth Annual Report of the *Evangelical Alliance* for the United States, 1873, which was received some weeks ago, furnishes a welcome opportunity for refreshing the memory of our readers on this interesting movement, and for keeping them duly informed of its successful progress.

From this report it is gratifying to learn, that the important objects of the Alliance continue to engage the lively interest of evangelical Christians, both in Europe and in this country. Among those more actively committed to the cause, it is cheering to find the names of the most distinguished Protestant theologians of the Continent and of England. Many of these have engaged, Providence favoring, to attend the next general meeting of the Alliance in New York. From Germany may be expected such representative men as Prof. Tischendorf, D.D., of Leipzig; Drs. Hoffman, of Berlin; Grundeman, of Potsdam; Pfeiderer, of Kornthal, Wurtemberg; Kleinert, of Berlin; Kraft, of Bonn; and H. Krummacher, of Brandenburg. From Switzerland: Astic, of Lausanne; Conlin and Pronier, of Geneva; Godet, of Neuchâtel; Von der Goltz, of Basle. From Paris: Eugene Bersier, Fisch, and Pere Hyacinth Loyson. From Holland: Van Osterzee, of Utrecht; and Van Loon, of Amsterdam. From England: Stoughton, Leathes, Harrison, Mullens, *Argus*, and William Arthur, of London. From Edinburgh, Scotland: Blaikie, Brown, Calderwood, Charteris, and Rainy. Dr. D. Brown, Aberdeen; Dr. Eadie, of Glasgow. This is a specimen of those who have conditionally promised to attend the meeting. Others no less prominent have expressed a desire to be present, and will endeavor to attend, though their pressing home duties may prevent them. Among these, are Dr. Presense, of Paris; Bishop (Lutheran) Martensen, of Copenhagen; Drs. Fairbairn and Buchanan, of Glasgow; and Dr. Dörner, of Berlin.

These names include representatives of the several national Reformed and Lutheran churches of Europe, which may, therefore, be regarded as in cordial

sympathy with the great objects of the Alliance, and as pledged to its support. Not that all calling themselves Lutherans, or in nominal union with the Reformed church in its different closely related branches share this sympathy, or endorse such a pledge. There are men in both churches whose theology and preferences for an ultra-sacerdotal or sacramentistic Christianity, keeps them wholly aloof from the Alliance, and inclines them rather to oppose it. They especially dislike its anti-Romish spirit and character.

There is too much of the Evangelical and of the Protestant about it to their taste. If ever they do refer to it, it is in the way of captious fault-finding, and carping criticisms, like that of the Lancaster party, through Dr. Gerhart some time ago.

This is to be regretted, especially for their sake. But the Alliance can do without them, if it must. Such dissent and opposition will not hinder its laudable attempts to secure fraternal coöperation among truly evangelical Christians, or the resistance of error, and the furtherance of the common cause. The honest and earnest effort to effect such a real union of action among all evangelical Christians, will not be frustrated by the antagonism of men (nominal Protestants), who, whilst ever ready to denounce the decisions of Protestantism, and to magnify the evils of such decisions, are ever found busy in putting obstacles in the way of every attempt to heed them and bring about a union in faith and fact, if not in external constitution and form.

Besides these foreign delegates to the meeting of the Alliance, a large number of American clergymen, scholars, and philanthropists has been invited; and the various auxiliary societies throughout the United States will be entitled to send delegates. The occasion promises to be one of intense interest and great importance for evangelical Christianity, and may well be commended to the warmest sympathies and fervent prayers of all who have the prosperity of the "faith once delivered to the saints" at heart.

To these statements we add the following, taken from the *New York Observer*, which will serve more fully to explain the nature, purposes and claims of the Alliance:

*Origin and History of the Alliance.*

In the year 1846, a large body of Protestant Christians from many countries were assembled in the city of London. They had been moved by a common desire to exhibit to the world the substantial agreement of Christians in the fundamental truths of the Christian religion, and to form an association to make that union practically efficient for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ. The assembly thus convened, included in its members some of the most distinguished scholars and divines of Europe and America. After thorough and fraternal deliberation, these learned and earnest men, representing all the denominations of Protestant Christendom, unanimously and heartily adopted the following declaration of principles, as the basis of doctrine on which all were agreed:

1. The divine inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures.
2. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.



3. The unity of the Godhead, and the trinity of the persons therein.
4. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the Fall.
5. The incarnation of the Son of God, His work of atonement for the sins of mankind, and His mediatorial intercession and reign.
6. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.
7. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.
8. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.
9. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the obligation and perpetuity of the ordinance of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

It being, however, distinctly declared, that the brief summary is not to be regarded in any formal or ecclesiastical sense as a creed or confession, nor the adoption of it as involving an assumption of the right authoritatively to define the limits of Christian brotherhood, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom it is desirable to embrace within the Alliance.

It was further resolved to organize branches in the various Christian countries, and to extend the influence of this Evangelical Union all over the world, thus bringing into harmonious action the combined forces of Christendom to promote religious liberty, and to spread the great principles of the Gospel. As the Papal power is the enemy of religious liberty, this Alliance resists that power. As every form of infidelity opposes the Gospel, this Alliance opposes all disguises and forms of infidelity. As vice and immorality are foes of religion, it seeks their suppression, and in the broadest philanthropy aims at the universal amelioration of the miseries of the human race. It is the embodiment of Christianity at work, to make the world better and happier.

Branches of the Alliance were soon organized in Great Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, the United States, and several other countries. From time to time, once in four or five years, delegates from all these branches have held a General Conference, to deliberate upon the most effectual ways and means of promoting the objects of the Alliance. These Conferences have been held in London, Paris, Berlin, Geneva and Amsterdam. Essays prepared by the wisest and best minds on questions of the deepest interest to the church and the world, have been read and discussed. The learned and pious men of Europe, overshadowed by the towering power of the Papacy, found in this Alliance the strength of union among themselves, and they have been more bold and efficient in their resistance to the aggressions of the Papacy, and the subtle but not less deadly assaults of modern infidelity. Thus, the Alliance has grown up to be the most powerful voluntary association of Christians in the world.

Its labors have been always and everywhere successful. It has spread the principles of religious liberty broadcast over every kingdom of Europe, and has planted its seeds in the heart of Asia. In any land where men are persecuted for conscience' sake—by Papal, Protestant, Mohammedan or Pagan power—there this Alliance goes; not sends, but goes, and asks in the name of God that the wrong may be stayed. And it never fails. Its voice is the voice of Christ,

in the person of His members; and the dead hear it. It went into Spain when one of the worst Papal bigots that ever sat on a throne was queen, and it compelled her to open the dungeons and let the prisoners, bound for Christ's sake and the Gospel, go free. It went away into Persia, and the Shah obeyed its voice. In Turkey the Sultan broke the yoke of ages from off the neck of his people, when this agency appeared.

Three years ago a cry came to this country from the Baltic provinces, under the dominion of the Czar of Russia, praying that the Alliance would send men to the Emperor, beseeching him to grant his subjects there the boon of religious liberty. The Alliance listened to the call, and deputed some of its noblest members—men of faith and power, and mightier in the name of Christ—to go to Russia and claim for those oppressed petitioners the rights of man!

And already, long before we could have expected, the concession is quietly made, and we have published the glad intelligence, that the people are allowed to worship God in their own way.

The General Conference met last in Amsterdam, in 1867, and then accepted an invitation from the Alliance in the United States, to meet next in the city of New York. It was arranged to hold such a Conference here in 1871, when the war between France and Germany suddenly threw Europe into convulsions and rendered it impossible for delegates to come to us from abroad. Arrangements are now in progress for the Conference to convene in this city on the second day of October next, and to sit ten days.

Representative men from the pulpits, universities, and schools of theology in all the European and some other countries, have engaged to attend, and they are now preparing, or have prepared, their contributions to the Conference. The programme assigns a distinct topic to each writer, and speeches will be made by illustrious orators. The sessions of the Conference will be held in Association Hall, and sections of it, in the German and French languages, in the churches immediately adjoining. Evening meetings for popular addresses will be held in the Academy of Music, the Cooper Union, and probably in Brooklyn and other cities. Unless some great and unexpected calamity prevents, the assembly will be the most respectable for weight of character, extent of representation, amount of learning and moral influence, that has ever been convened in the United States.

It is impossible to say how many delegates and friends will be convened from foreign parts, but so many are sure to come that an opportunity will be given to all Christian families who desire it, to exercise the beautiful Christian grace of hospitality. The German gentlemen will be entertained by German Christian families. The French will be invited to homes where the French language is spoken. Our venerable Dr. DeWitt will welcome all who speak the Dutch. And the men of England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and other countries, are to be received by those who will throw open their doors, and for a few days make these strangers partakers of their cheer. The only difficulty to be apprehended, arises from the fact that many families do not return to town from the country so early as the first of October. But they will never have another opportunity of enjoying such a convocation as this, and if hundreds cross the ocean to attend

it, our people will certainly come in from the country for the sake of such a privilege.

Christian friends may, therefore, aid in making this Conference a success, by contributions of money, or hospitality, or both; and they may give their names and contributions for this purpose to their pastor, or send them directly to "The Evangelical Alliance, No. 38 Bible House, New York city."

---

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

IN this number of the Repertory we continue the publication of addresses delivered at the last anniversary of the Zwinglian Literary Society. It is gratifying to us to know, that our course in this respect is proving acceptable to so many, probably, all of our friends, and that the addresses of the young gentlemen representing both Societies, are so warmly welcomed and so generally appreciated. This fact will not only encourage them and their successors to hold on in their way, but will stimulate them to renewed and increased endeavors to make their efforts even more worthy of favor. Through the pages of the *Monthly* their voices can be heard by many interested hundreds, who could not be present at the oral delivery of the addresses.

### HOW TO BE HAPPY.

WE feel this evening as if we needed the invocation of blind John Milton, when he said :

"Chiefly thou, O Spirit, that dost prefer  
Before all temples the upright heart and pure,  
Instruct me, for thou know'st; thou from the first  
Was present, and, with mighty wings outspread,  
Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,  
And mad'st it pregnant; what in me is dark,  
Illuminate! what is low, raise and support!  
That to the height of this great argument  
I may assert eternal Providence,  
And justify the ways of God to men."

We are not of that class who think—

"What thing so good which not some harm may bring?  
Even to be happy is a dangerous thing."  
It is every one's duty to ever strive for happiness,  
Not only for himself, but for all about him.

The mainspring of every thought that has flitted through the mind of man,



of every word that has fallen from his lips, of every voluntary action since the dawn of creation, has been happiness, for self or another, now or hereafter.

What is happiness? Pope says:

"Who that define it, say they more or less  
Than this, that happiness is happiness."

The devices of the crafty, the wisdom of the learned, the benevolence of the good, in all ages, have been exhausted in attempting to define it, in seeking for the path that leads to it, or in pursuing the "*ignis fatuus*" of what they thought it to be. Thales, of Miletus, found great pleasure in searching for the first principle of all things. Pythagoras, of Samos, undoubtedly felt great satisfaction when he demonstrated the theory of the music of the spheres—"The planets striking on the ether through which they pass, must produce a sound; this must vary according to their different magnitudes, velocities, and relative distances; these differences were all adjusted with perfect regularity and exact proportions, so that the movement of the bodies produces the richest tones of harmony, not heard, however, by mortal ears." Socrates taught, that virtue and piety are as certainly followed by happiness, as cause by effects. The Cynics thought that mankind should discard all speculation and science, and practice the most rigid self-denial, which theory Diogenes carried out by living in a tub and snarling at all who came near him. Zeno, of Cyprus, believed that, "whatever is, is right;" that all things are controlled by an eternal necessity, or fate, consequently that indifference to pleasure or pain, is the state of mind essential to happiness. Xenophane, of Colophon, said there is no real change in anything except in our senses. I think myself he was about half right; for Burns says, "Mankind are such fools for all their colleges and schools, that when no real ills perplex them, they make enough of themselves to vex them." And were not twenty persons hanged by the Pilgrim Fathers in the days of the Salem witchcraft "for causing, what was after all only an imaginary unhappiness?" Another sect found *their* pleasure in intemperance and luxury. After all these conflicting and curious notions, is it any wonder that Pyrrho taught, that nothing is certain, so no assertion should be made, that the truth of nothing can be proved beyond a doubt, so nothing should be believed.

The Thugs of India, and the assassins of Hassan, the "old man of the mountain," made it their religion and pleasure to murder. The ideas entertained by the Ancients respecting future felicity, were as varied as those just mentioned, touching present enjoyment. The dweller by the Nile, after death, was embalmed and laid away carefully in an underground chamber, that his soul might rest in peace. Not an altogether useless proceeding, for it is said that mummies make an excellent fertilizer, and mummy cases dried for 3000 years make good kindling wood for the wild Arab. The orthodox Grecian believed that the shade of an unburied man wandered unhappy for a hundred years, up and down the banks of the river Styx, unable to cross. If buried, the corpse must have a cake to appease the three-headed dog Cerebus, at the gates of Hades, and a piece of money due to Charon for ferriage over the said river. Entering Hades, and sentenced by Minos and his fellow judges, he must depart to Tar-

tarus, "a hideous prison of immense depth, surrounded by the miry bogs of Kositus, and the river Plegethon, rolling with torrents of flame; here the furies torment their wretched victims, and all the wicked suffer according to their crimes;" or, he is consigned to the Fortunate Isles, the happy Elysium, "adorned with beautiful gardens, smiling meadows, and enchanting groves, where the birds ever sweetly warble, where the river Eridanus winds between banks fringed with laurel, and divine Lethe glides in a quiet valley, where the air is always pure and the day serene, where the blessed have their delightful abode." The religion of the fierce Scandinavian, made it duty to fight. He spent his last breath in telling of warriors that had fallen beneath his arm, of scenes of carnage through which he had passed; and, dying in battle, he felt assured his soul would at once wing its joyful flight, circling upward to the halls of Odin, where no coward ever enters. Living and dying, thus he partook of the pleasures of Valhalla, where fighting, and at intervals carousing upon beer, drank from the skulls of their enemies, are the occupations of the blessed. The last pastime, methinks, would be quite acceptable to many at this day—judging by election returns. A knowledge of the errors of those who have gone before us, should lead us to live more wisely than they. But I fear it does not, for to most of mankind at this day, money-wealth is the panacea, the remedy for all evils that flesh and spirit are heir to. There are many who still worship the "Golden Calf." God never intended man to be happy by accumulating wealth, or he would have made him a mere animal without a soul. The bee is successful, and no doubt happy in her own way, while gathering "in artful cells her luscious hoard," and neither has nor needs a soul.

The giddy, heartless, soulless, nonsense of modern fashionable society, with its mazy dance, and wine cup, driving care away only to bring more, offers hopes of enjoyment to many; but they who have fallen in with her offers, find it too late, with body weakened and mind demented, that they have chosen the "primrose way to everlasting destruction." Fame stands upon her dizzy height and holds her laurels aloft to the view of gaping mortals, proclaiming happiness to him whose name is upon the lips of all. Fame is but an empty bubble, said Horace Greeley; yes, as he found it apt to burst and vanish entirely.

"Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." If neither wealth, society or fame, bring true enjoyment, think you that wisdom, hoary wisdom, has hidden away in her mines, treasures of happiness yet untold. Her merchandise is better than the merchandise of silver and gold. Yet the wisest man, Solomon, was by no means the happiest. Learning will never satisfy, for the more a man knows, the more he wishes to know. When he comes to barriers he cannot pass, to depths he cannot fathom, what longings unsatisfied, longings to pass these barriers, to peer into and *fathom* this boundless ocean of the unknown. The happy man whose placid bosom not a ripple of unhappiness ever ruffles, who is he? Where can he be found? (I am not sure that he exists, except ideally.) He does not nurse the old exploded theories of ancient philosophers, hatched out again and proclaimed as new by some modern would-be reformer. He may be either rich or poor, as the world counts riches, yet making many rich in immortal wealth. Steering clear of the whirlpool of fashion-

able society, famed it may be for goodness, he values more highly the smiles of God than the plaudits of his fellow men, and fears more His frowning than the anger of short-sighted mortals. He looks upon all affliction as the furnace from which he shall issue purified, brighter and more useful than ever, always returns blessing for cursing, good for evil. If so happy as to fall into tribulation, even torture and death for conscience' sake, joying that he is accounted worthy so to suffer; and at last fall asleep, like Stephen, with the heavens open above him, God and the holy angels looking down from the high battlements of the celestial city and beckoning him to come, waiting to receive him, where there is, in truth, a city paved with pure gold; where there is the river of life, and on its banks the tree of life; where there is no night, and they need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light, where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest, where there is an eternity of happiness.

Show me a man so living and dying, a true follower of the despised Nazarene, and I will show you a man, happy now, and forever.

J. J.

---

#### THE DUTIES OF LIFE.

THIS life is the state of active existence. It is a state preparatory to an introduction to a higher and a holier one. Our actions here, consequently, will have a most vital bearing on our condition hereafter. How manifest the necessity of turning to good account the opportunities and privileges placed within our reach, by the performance of duties incumbent upon us, as physical, intellectual, moral and religious beings.

Here, then, we have a subject worthy of our consideration—a subject that should engage the attention of all truly thoughtful men. We will then endeavor to set forth the great importance of the proper development of the physical, intellectual, moral and religious nature of man, having religion as the proper basis of this development. For these properly involve *the* duties of life.

We have mentioned them in an inverse order, according to their importance. For the soul, as it is commonly designated, occupies the highest place, in consequence of which it should receive the first and the chief training. The intellect is next in significance; and the body is last.

But, notwithstanding the prominence given to any one of these, each should receive the training peculiar to its own nature; for the Creator will hold His rational creatures accountable for the neglect or misuse of any of these powers.

It must be obvious to all, that the body has not ordinarily received proper treatment, even by religious persons. It has been common to undervalue its functions to such an extent that, having been neglected, they have become almost inactive. The body is often spoken of as being utterly incapable of use. It is shielded from the genial rays of the sun, and the blasts of wind, as exposure to these elements would tarnish the features of the body. It is cramped



with food, and pampered with luxuries, until the functions almost refuse to perform their allotted work.

View it "*as a piece of Divine workmanship*," and how is it possible that any Christian can look upon it with indifference. The human form is the culmination of the Divine handiwork. Among the stars that deck the blue canopy of heaven, among the inhabitants of earth, there is nothing comparable with it. "Of all the flowers that bloomed in Eden, Eve was the most beautiful." Above all the animals that roved there, Adam, not alone because of his animated and informing soul, but because of his superior *physical* capacity, stood the manifested king.

View the body *as the temple and organ of the soul*, the great importance of its being properly trained, will be still more obvious. It is the medium through which the soul becomes acquainted with the external world; and not only do the senses make the soul familiar with external objects, but its powers are used in giving utterance to the soul's behests.

The organs of the body are the appointed means through which the soul has communication with the world, and avenues, so to speak, for the admission of the world of sense into that of mind and spirit.

Inasmuch as there is such an intimate connection between the soul and body, it must be evident that the body not only requires, but demands, proper training in order to facilitate the development of the soul. The former must be kept in a healthy and a pure condition in order that it may be subservient to the soul's interests. This may be done properly by a due observance of the laws of health, in exercising temperance in all things, thus keeping the body chaste, and free from all moral defilement.

The framer of our bodies also formed us with minds. However useful and noble our bodies are, the mind far surpasses in importance and excellence any qualities of our bodies. This mind needs culture in order to subserve the ends for which it was created.

*Christianity* requires the cultivation of our intellectual faculties. It is not, as some think, the ally of ignorance, and hostile to mental culture. By rejecting religion, they reject the greatest incentive and help to this culture, which they prize so highly. It would, indeed, be a doleful thing, had we to admit that Christianity is inimical to mental culture. If this would be the case, it would alienate all thoughtful men from it.

Consider how much the intellect is connected with human happiness. There are those who imagine that "ignorance is bliss," that the savage with his few advantages, his few wants and cares, is as happy, and even more so, than the individual having many responsibilities and cares, and surrounded with the luxuries and delicacies of civilization. This might be granted if we would only consider the differences in their external circumstances; because, while civilization has its advantages, it has also its responsibilities. But we know that a man of pure thoughts and ennobling principles will experience happiness, even in great adversity, while, on the contrary, a mind at ease with itself will be wretched, though compassed about on all sides by sources of enjoyment.

The man of education sees beauty and grandeur in the flowers and plants of

the field, which the uneducated will pass by unnoticed. If we take our position at the base of a mountain, beholding it in wonder and amazement, as a monument of God's power, is not our joy greater than his who only sees in it a large mass of matter, and whose mind is not struck with awe and admiration at its magnitude and sublimity? The astronomer gazing up into the depths of space, when beholding the planet in whose existence he had believed long previous to its discovery, is seized with a transport of joy. Compare his happiness with that of the man who regards the stars of the firmament as so many lamps, placed there only to give diversity to the blue vault of heaven; or who, in his ignorance, laughs at the folly of those who attempt to measure and weigh them, whose mind never penetrates further than his eye can see.

By our intellectual faculties we are chiefly distinguished from the brute, which is mainly governed by instinct, whereas man is guided by reason. Hence, there can be no development in the brute creation. Each successive generation is no wiser than its predecessor. The bird built its nest, and the beaver its dam in the primitive ages of the world as well as they do now. The foxes in Nimrod's day, had the same swiftness and cunning as the foxes of the 19th century.

But our subject leads us a step further. Mere physical training and mental discipline are not enough. There is a higher and a nobler nature in man, which is far superior to the mental and physical. This, which we designate by the title, the moral and spiritual nature, should be first in the order of development. This nature, properly cultured, disposes us to love and delight in spiritual things.

In order to the development of our moral nature, we must cultivate that monitor within us which enables us to discriminate between good and evil. This monitor, we call conscience. It is implanted by God, and nothing should interpose between God and it. To disobey it, is to do violence to our moral nature. Christianity appeals to our sense of right. It challenges this moral nature to judge between God and us.

The noblest part of our nature, is the religious. The capacity of its faculties, which fit us for knowing, loving and adoring God, constitutes their noblest quality.

By meditating upon the divine perfections, devotional feelings are produced. In proportion as these feelings are cultivated, the soul rises into a higher life, and moves amidst purer elements, which react upon it with quickening and with sanctifying power.

Let us try to form the habit of cultivating such devout feelings towards God, by endeavoring to realize how much He has done for us in these respects. Then, by diligent self-culture, we will enlarge and strengthen our entire intellectual, moral and spiritual nature. Then will our whole being be more and more transformed into the glorious image of our Master. The blessings flowing down from above, will penetrate our whole frame, elevating and ennobling all its powers.

J. H. H.

## COLLEGE ITEMS.

FIRST among the items of special interest, in a pleasant way, we announce as *Married*, April 8th, at Ursinus College, the *Rev. Henry Leiss*, of Orwigsburg, Pa., to Miss *Hannah R. Alderfer*, of Trappe. Brother Leiss is the first Alumnus of the College who has thus availed himself of one of the earliest divinely appointed aids in the work of life, and so furnished additional proof of the full earnestness with which he has entered upon the discharge of those duties. Glad ourselves to have had the privilege of performing the pleasant service in this case, we are sure, also, that both Mr. Leiss and his partner have the best wishes of all connected with our school, and the Trappe congregation and community, for a long and happy life.

On April 21st (Monday afternoon), we were favored with a brief (too brief for our entire satisfaction), visit by the veteran Missionary, the Rev. B. Schneider, D.D., of Broosa, Asia Minor, and his faithful wife and co-worker. \* During the afternoon, Dr. Schneider (whose birth-place and early home is only a few miles northwest of this place), delivered a very instructive and interesting address to the students of the College, and a few friends of the immediate vicinity, in the College chapel. His description of the trials and encouragement of missionary life, secured earnest attention; and we hope that impressions were made which will lead some, at least, of the young men, seriously to ponder the question of their duty in regard to the work of missions among the heathen, or among churches which have fallen into spiritual decay. It was gratifying and inspiring to observe, that although Dr. S. has been forty years in the field, and is beginning to show outward signs of advancing age, his missionary ardor is youthful, and his zeal unabated. The season of partial rest, which he is now enjoying, is having a restorative effect, also, on his impaired health, so that he expects by next fall to return again to his field of labor.

The *Spring Term* of the College, which opened April 7th, brought with it not only its duties and cares, but also good cheer. Our expectations have been fully realized. Along with the old students who returned, there has been an accession of twenty new ones, including several who entered advanced College classes, or who expect to take a full College course, some with a view to the Gospel ministry.

*Slowly but beautifully* the College lawn, with its ornamental trees and shrubbery, is escaping from the cold grasp of a seemingly inexorable winter, and clothing itself with its vernal attire—as the imaginative sophomore might say. (By the way, the sprightly sophomore must not allow himself to be laughed wholly out of his imaginative feats, by more dignified posers. It is better to have even a capering imagination than none at all. Only let the faculty be properly cultivated, brought under due rational control, and learn how to fly, leap, dance, dash, or—"according to law.") The base ball and croquet ground is gradually becoming more solid, and it is enough to rejuvenate old muscles to see the zest and hilarity with which the young men avail themselves of the



opportunity for such bodily exercises as are profitable, if indulged with due moderation.

*Acknowledgments.*—Received for Beneficiary Education Fund, in Ursinus College, since the February acknowledgments, from—

Rev. H. A. Keyser, Mahanoy city.....	\$50 00
Immanuel M. Kelker, Harrisburg.....	24 42
A friend in Philadelphia.....	10 00
Rev. D. Ziegler, York.....	10 00
Rev. A. Spangler, New Oxford.....	28 00
A friend in C.....	10 00
Ladies' Society of the Race street Reformed church, Philadelphia.....	25 00

## EDITOR'S DESK.

Among the articles of the present number of the *Monthly*, it was intended to have one in review of Rev. Mr. *Rupp's* article on *Regeneration*, which appeared in the *Mercersburg Review* for January. But as the author is out in the *Messenger*, in a series of articles defending his peculiar theory (which is substantially the Mercersburg or Nevinite view of the subject), it is only fair to postpone our criticisms until he has concluded his vindication. Meanwhile, however, we note two or three points: 1. The obvious fact that Mr. R. was not satisfied with the awkward attempt of the editor of the *Messenger* to defend and explain his (R.'s) theory. He saw, of course, that Dr. Fisher had wholly missed *the point* in his (R.'s) article, and that the *Messenger* editorial assumed and went upon a theory of regeneration and baptism essentially different from that advocated in the *Review* article. The trouble is, that Dr. Fisher wants to make Nevinism seem to be in harmony with the generally received faith of the Reformed church, and so makes havoc of both; though, of course, he don't see it.

2. Another point concerns an apparently unconscious delusion of Mr. R. in the course of his attempt at self-defense. Take one illustration. He speaks of *the grace of baptism*, and *baptismal regeneration*, as though they were fairly interchangeable synonyms. He assumes, that to allow of sacramental grace at all, necessarily involves what Nevinism holds in regard to such grace. Now, just this is one of the things we most positively deny. We hold to sacramental grace as really and as firmly as the most ardent Nevinite can do so. The Reformed church did, long before Nevinism began to disturb its doctrinal foundation, or to play at speculations with its general faith. And neither friend R., nor any other of that school, should expect to be allowed to glide without being challenged, from pleading for baptismal grace, to contending for baptismal regeneration, as though they meant the same thing.

3. Once more, it must not be forgotten, that in any appeals made, in assumed support of peculiar views advanced, to such standard Reformed authorities as

*Ursinus*, it is not sufficient or fair to quote single and detached passages or statements, unless they are full, and so explicit as to allow of but one sense. The author is his own best interpreter. If at one place he expresses himself in a manner susceptible of two senses, that sense must be taken as the true one which harmonizes best with the general principle and tenor of his theology. Moreover, we do not depend for our knowledge of the views of Ursinus upon the Commentary on the Catechism alone. There are other writings of his to be consulted, and from which we may learn his faith. To this must be added, that Ursinus is not the only standard Reformed theologian. There are others worthy of being consulted in any honest attempt to ascertain the truth in the case.

A very interesting *disputation* has been going on recently in the *Messenger*, between G. (Rev. Gans, D.D.), and our esteemed friend L. H. S. (L. H. Steiner, M.D.) In entire accordance with his high-church proclivities, G. indulged in an assault upon the public school system. One ground of complaint, was the the old one, of course, viz: That State or public schools are conducted upon an irreligious, or anti-Christian, or infidel plan, because they do not use the Romish or some other Catechism in teaching arithmetic, grammar, geography and history; and, furthermore, they make no account of the new-order of worship. Another and more alarming evil which G. finds is, that the State intends, as he blunderingly asserts, to make education in its schools *compulsory*. L. H. S., a warm advocate of a Christian education, nevertheless, with intelligence to see and admit that by a very natural and reasonable division of labor, secular schools, (*just exactly as in the case of strictly church schools*), may limit their work to secular branches, leaving religious instruction to the home and the church, without being infidel, exposed the fallacy and injustice of G.'s assault, and very politely but plainly set him (G.) right on the other point. G. became indignant that a layman should have the presumption to cross his path, or expose the infirmity of his logic. Thereupon Dr. S. bows himself off the arena, and leaves the angry high-toned gladiator to cutting the air for himself.

It is told of the eccentric John Randolph, of Roanoke, that one day going along Chestnut street, Philadelphia, he met face to face an exquisitely dressed young man, sporting a polished cane, who refused to yield the way an inch. After standing a moment, as in a dilemma, the young gentleman, lifting himself to his full height, said sharply: I don't get out of the way of dogs, sir. To this Randolph quickly replied in his shrill voice: *I do*, and stepped aside to leave the young cur pass. The lesson is a good one.

*Presbyterians and Congregationalists are becoming liturgical*, says (Dr. Fisher in) the *Messenger*, and he seems to be wonderfully pleased at being able to report the fact. He (Dr. Fisher) don't like the new-order ritualism, and altogether prefers less of such ceremonialism than more, as he has often told persons. But, wishing to please friends, and knowing that any indication seeming at all favorable to new-orderism will please them, he permits no opportunity to pass of gratifying their hungry souls. This time it is some Presbyterian minister in Chicago who furnishes the opportunity. It is too good (for Lancas-

ter) to let pass. *Presbyterians* and *Congregationalists* are yielding to the powerful influence of *Nevinism*, and are panting after more ritualism in their public worship! At least, this is what the *Messenger* would have us believe. In proof, it appeals—to what? Why, the wonderful fact, that the Rev. L. H. Reid wrote an article for the "*Interior*," a paper published in Chicago, advocating a responsive use of the psalms; and that two or three ministers in Brooklyn, New York, have introduced some liturgical services into their Sunday worship! Because Mr. Reid and two or three congregationalist clergymen have let a love of novelty or some personal freak, lead them to favor ritualism, lo! it eagerly proclaims that the Presbyterian and Congregationalist churches are following in the wake of modern *Nevinite* reformers! Wonderful logic! Marvellous triumph!

*But*, first of all, if two or three dozen, or score of ministers in the Eastern Synod of our church, should do or propose to do anything contrary to its way and will, this same *Messenger* (Dr. Fisher) would simply denounce them as *factions*, seditious, and worthy of reprobation. When, however, two or three of another church (corresponding with the little clique which started the new-order system in its most offensive form in our church), propose, in violation of the rules and usages of their church to introduce ritualism, only a little, oh then the *Messenger*, hailing it as an evidence in its favor, can commend it in strong terms as all right—of course.

*But*, again, the *Messenger* (that is, Dr. Fisher, if he really wrote the editorial) has not taken pains to inform itself fully in regard to this matter. Hence, as in the noted North Carolina case, it speaks in a way to make sadly wrong impressions. Now, we have the following facts from those who have the best opportunity of knowing whereof they speak.

1. There are *not a half dozen* congregations (Presbyterian or Congregationalist), into which anything *approaching the new-order ritual* has been introduced. This reduces the matter of the boasted use of such a service in those churches, considering how *many thousand congregations* they embrace, to such insignificance, that one might think the *Messenger* would blush to cite the three or four cases of which it knows, as a *proof of tendency* in those churches.

2. In the pitifully small number of congregations in which any attempt that way has been made, the ritualistic services are exceedingly limited, and are largely combined with free-prayer-worship in the old Reformed style.

3. Wherever the experiment has been tried, it has proven, virtually, a failure; just as it has proven, and is proving in our church, notwithstanding the artifices and accommodations employed. It is so in *St. Peter's* Presbyterian church, in Rochester. It is stated to be so in the Brooklyn churches, where it has been *slightly* tried. It is so in a new (Broad street) church, in Philadelphia, where it has been attempted.

4. All this is true, notwithstanding individual efforts have been made for years, by a few (three or four) clergymen of some influence in those churches, to "*improve*" their public worship by giving it some artistic (*æsthetic*) touches in the form of ritualistic ornaments.

If the *Messenger* will refer to "*signs of the times*," why does it not tell the



whole truth in the case? Why give only so much as has all the effect of a falsehood?

It may be readily admitted that, to a sad extent, the public worship of our Reformed churches (as well as others), is defective. But the remedy will be as vainly sought in ritualism, as if it were hoped to heal a broken heart by covering it outside with a peacock's plume, or to cure blindness by wearing gold spectacles. What is needed, where the need exists, is not a book of common prayer, bound in Turkey morocco, and brilliantly embossed with a gilded cross—but "*the Spirit of grace and of supplication.*"

*Errata.* It hardly pays, according to our experience, to quarrel with type for mistakes in printing, which often occur. Besides, the fault oftener lies with writers than compositors. But to prevent or correct misapprehension, we note the following errors in the April number. On page 181, for "have been a disheartening, &c.," read "have *had.*" On page 182, line 11, for "as many of," read "as many as;" and lower down, for *Classis*, read *Classes*. On page 183, line 5, for *most*, read *more*. On page 184, line 19, read *interests*; and line 22, for *we doubt*, read *no doubt*. On 186, below, after *rubbish*, insert *of*. On 191, below, for *happiness*, read *happiest*. On 192, line 14, from below, for *fair*, read *mere*.

"*Bills.*" One of our best *Exchange* papers has the following queer paragraph at the head of its editorial columns. It must have produced a strange effect upon some of its readers. The fact is, that the thing complained of, seems an epidemic ailment: "We have made out bills and mailed them to those of our subscribers who are in arrears. The number of remittances already received compares favorably with any previous year, and we are glad to find that in so many instances our gentle reminders are promptly and cheerfully answered. There are quite a large proportion of subscribers whose payments are in arrears two, three, four, and five years. We trust they will not continue to be silent, but *this* time send us the amount of their indebtedness. If they do not consider our paper worth the money, they should at least pay what they owe and order its discontinuance; if they do value it, will they not relieve themselves and us of the annoyance of an unpaid and just debt? Our own obligations must be promptly met, and the establishment of similarly satisfactory relations between publisher and subscribers, is very desirable. Please remit the amount of our bill as soon as possible."

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH.—*Ministerial Changes:*

Rev. J. M. Grether has changed his post-office address from Warren, Trumbull county, to Hartville, Stark county, Ohio. Rev. Samuel Shaw, from Reedsburg to Congress, Wayne county, Ohio. Rev. Christian Kessler, from Reading to Lehighton, Carbon county, Pa. Rev. J. B. Shumaker, from Canton, Ohio,

to Lancaster, Pa. Rev. W. Diechman's post-office address, is in care of Rev. J. F. H. Diechman, Galion, Ohio. Rev. James Schultz, from Schaefferstown to Reading, Pa. Rev. C. A. Limberg, from Butler, Pa., to Williamsburg, New York. Rev. G. W. Aughinbaugh, from Reigelsville to Myerstown, Lebanon county, Pa. Rev. John Kratzing, from Cochranville, Crawford county, Pa., to Lykens, Dauphin county, Pa. Rev. J. Kercher, from Lacon to La Rose, Marshall county, Illinois. [Rev. Carl Schied, from Washington, D. C., to Union Spring, Cayuga county, New York. Rev. J. J. Pennepacker, from Dayton, Pa., to Rimersburg, Clarion county, Pa. Rev. George H. Johnston, from Somerset to Easton, Pa. Rev. Joseph H. Apple, from Germantown, Ohio, to Seagerstown, Crawford county, Pa.]

ADDITION TO CHURCHES.—Seventeen persons were added to the Shelby, Ohio, charge, Rev. N. H. Loose, pastor. Sixteen were added to West Alexandria, Ohio, charge, Rev. Austin Henry, pastor. Four were added to Mt. Pleasant charge, Hillgrove, Ohio, Rev. J. Stuck, pastor. Nine were added to Wilton, Iowa, charge, Rev. P. J. Shontz, pastor. Six were added to the Canton, Ohio, charge. Twenty-two were added to the Emmanuel's charge, York county, Pa., Rev. J. D. Zehring, pastor. Nine were added to Newport, Perry county, Pa., charge, Rev. James Crawford, pastor. Six were added to the First Reformed church of Baltimore, Md., Rev. E. R. Eshbach, pastor. Six were added to Boehm's charge, Rev. C. G. Fisher, pastor. Twelve were added to Trinity Reformed church, Philadelphia, Rev. D. E. Klopp, pastor. Seventy-seven were added to Zion's Reformed church, Philadelphia, Rev. N. Gehr, pastor. Fifty-two were added to Bethlehem's church, Philadelphia, Rev. J. G. Neuber, pastor. One hundred and fifty-one were added to Salem's church, Philadelphia, Rev. J. G. Wiehle, pastor. Thirty-seven were added to Myerstown, Pa., charge, Rev. George Wolff, pastor. Eleven were added to the First Reformed church, Lancaster, Pa., Rev. Dr. A. H. Kremer, pastor. Forty-three were added to the Altoona, Pa., charge, Rev. A. C. Whitmer, pastor. Thirty were added to the Trinity Reformed church at Pottstown, Rev. L. H. Evans, pastor. Twenty-five were added to St. John's church (German), Lancaster, Pa., Rev. W. T. Gerhard, pastor. Twenty-eight were added to the Third Reformed church, of Baltimore, Dr. Gans, pastor. Fifteen were added to the Sunbury, Pa., charge, Rev. Calvin Gerhard, pastor. Sixteen orphans were confirmed by the Rev. Daniel B. Albright, at the church connected with the Orphans' Home, Womelsdorf, Pa. Eight were added to the First Reformed church, of Hagerstown, Md., Rev. J. S. Kieffer, pastor. Sixty-nine were added to the Egypt, Pa., charge, Rev. S. A. Leinbach, pastor. Ten were added to the First Reformed church, Easton, Pa., Rev. John Beck, pastor. Thirteen were added to the Shepherdstown, West Virginia, charge, Rev. J. T. Rossiter, pastor. Twenty were added to the First Reformed church of Harrisburg, Pa., Rev. W. H. H. Snyder, pastor. Six were added to the Dayton, Ohio, charge, Rev. Dr. Winters, pastor. Nine were added to the church at La Rose, Marshall county, Illinois, Rev. John Kercher, pastor. One was added to the Xenia church, Rev. S. B. Tockey, pastor. Six were added to the Miamisburg, Ohio, charge, Rev. I. H. Reiter, pastor. Twenty-four were added

to the First Reformed church, Tiffin, Ohio. Twenty-three were added to the Apple Creek church, Wooster, Ohio, Rev. Father D. Kemmerer, pastor. Twenty-one were added to St. John's Reformed church, of Hamburg, Pa., Rev. W. F. P. Davis, pastor. Eight were added to the McKeansburg, Pa., charge, Rev. N. Leiss, pastor. Springfield congregation, Bucks county, Pa., Rev. Henry Hess, pastor, 21 by confirmation, including two heads of families, and two by baptism.

The following has been kindly furnished by a student, who participated in the privileges of the occasion: On Easter, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered in the Reformed church at Myerstown, Pa., under the pastorate of Rev. George Wolff. Impressive and interesting sermons were preached. The services were of great interest and solemnity. The church was well filled, and a large number communed. Rev. A. Spangler, of Oxford, Pa., assisted the pastor of the charge. Evening services were held during the week, and preparatory service on Good Friday, when twenty-seven persons were added to the church by the rite of confirmation. Of these, three were baptized; ten persons were received by letter.

ORDINATIONS.—Austin Henry was ordained and installed pastor of the Kinnickinnich, Lancaster Classis. The ordination sermon was preached by Rev. Eli Keller, of Winchester charge; Rev. W. A. Hale, of Lancaster, delivered the charge to the pastor. Rev. L. M. Shuford was installed pastor of the Burkittsville charge. Rev. Nicholas Wicos was ordained to the Gospel ministry in Salem's Reformed church, Cincinnati, Ohio, as an assistant to the Rev. C. Sauser.

RESIGNATION.—Rev. Samuel H. Reid has resigned the pastorate charge of Milton, Pa. Rev. L. Gerhart, of Whitmarsh, has accepted a call to Rieglesville, Pa.

DEATH.—The church has been apprised of the death of the Rev. D. Zacharias, D.D., of Frederick city, which occurred on March 31st. The following obituary, evidently from the pen of a friend intimately acquainted with the great personal worth and public labors of our lamented brother, now gone to his heavenly rest, is taken from the *Frederick Examiner*:

"On Monday, at 2:20 a. m., this venerable clergyman breathed his last. For nearly thirty-eight years (he arrived in Frederick, April 3d, 1835, and preached his first sermon as pastor on the 5th of the same month), he has had the Reformed church of this city under his pastoral care. Few have been so loved by their congregations, or have so grown into the affections of the community in which they lived. His kindly smile, prepossessing manners—combining chivalric courtesy with Christian sincerity—his sympathetic heart—ever open to the sorrows or joys of his fellow men, and the rich tones of a musical voice that was never employed except in utterances of love and affection—these made him welcome at every fireside and at every event in the family. The news of his death will bring sorrow to many who have been grateful recipients of his personal ministrations, to whose dying parents he has given the



consolations of the Gospel, whose infants he has received into the church by the rite of baptism, whose confirmation of their baptismal vows he has witnessed at the altar, and over whose marriages he has invoked the blessing of his Master. The sympathies of the community are with the family in this hour of their affliction, and prayers are offered from full hearts, that the consolation which comes not from earth, but from above, may be afforded them. Dr. Zacharias was a native of Washington county, having been born near Clear Spring. His classical education was received at the Hagerstown Academy, and Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa. His theological studies were prosecuted at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed church (then located at Carlisle, Pa.,) under Rev. Dr. Lewis Mayer. During this time he attended some of the lectures in Dickenson College, which was then in charge of Dr. Nesbitt. Shortly after the completion of his theological studies, he was chosen as pastor of the Reformed church at Harrisburg, from which place he was called to Frederick in 1835. He was one of the most prominent members in his denomination, and was frequently selected by the preference of his brethren to preside over their ecclesiastical assemblies."

*Rev. Isaac Shellb*, on February 22d, of dropsy of the heart, in the 72d year of his age. The labors of his ministerial life extended over 46 years, were confined to sections not very distant from the place of his birth, Brier Creek, Northumberland county, Pa. He appears to have been of an unusually retiring spirit, rarely going beyond the bounds of his charge, but devoting himself faithfully to his work there.

The past winter has proven sadly fatal to the ranks of our ministry, no less than five having fallen in as many months, the list beginning with Rev. H. Wiegand, the highly esteemed, laborious and successful pastor, at the time, of the White Pigeon charge, Michigan.

The following obituary of a very excellent young man, which has been furnished by a loving hand, is cheerfully inserted in our pages:

On the 21st day of April, at Myerstown, Pa., after an illness of some three weeks, John Calvin Leisse, aged 19 years, 5 months, and 28 days.

Mr. Leisse had been for several years, prior to his taking sick, studying the classics, mathematics, and music, in Palatinate College. He was especially devoted to music, and excelled in the same. It is not, however, to these things that we would attract attention, but it is to the beautiful character possessed by the deceased. The early death of his father had left a large fortune for him in the hands of a guardian. This did not make him vain and proud. He was humble, truthful, temperate and generous. These traits shone out at all times. They made him a mark, and drew upon him the admiration of all good men. And still more and better, he was an earnest Christian, strict in church duties, and a worker in the Sabbath school. His life, though short, already exhibited the distinct acts of a loving heart toward God. Kind and pure, in him was fully transmitted the noble character of a noble father, and the refinement of an excellent mother. Faithful, true, and good, he has gone to his long home, regretted and mourned by all who ever knew him. Peace to him, and love and kindness forever.

WM. PAINTER & CO.,  
BANKERS,  
No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

---

Gold, Stocks and Bonds

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE  
*PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.*

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.

---

## MORNING SUNBEAMS

For the playroom, Schoolroom, and Nursery. Selected by Mrs. E. Prentiss for the little folks, to hang on their chamber and schoolroom walls, like the "Silent Comforter" in hospitals, and furnish a divine talisman for every day. Folio. 32 pp. 75c.; post. 10c.

## PRAYER.

A new and attractive devotional manual, containing suggestions and hints from our best writers, on the Lord's Prayer, and prayer in general. 104 pp. large 32mo. 20c.; post 4c.

## THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT.

Lessons from Christ's conflict and victory. By Rev. A. F. Dickson. The teacher of youth, the tempted and the troubled Christian, will find it valuable. 144 pp. 18mo. 40c.; post 8c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISELL,  
1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

SPRING TERM, 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The WINTER TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, will open on Monday, APRIL 7, 1873, and continue sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

WILLIAM H. SNYDER, Instructor in the Academic Department.

J. G. NEFF, Tutor.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.—JUNE, 1873.—No. 6.

---

THE PENTECOST AT CÆSAREA.

It was not in Jerusalem, neither was it on a feast day, and yet the Holy Ghost descended upon those assembled, so that they received the gift of the Holy Ghost, as did the disciples gathered in that upper room in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost. There was a second spiritual Pentecost, but one which took place *under circumstances notably different from those of the former one*. In itself the occasion was one of solemn interest. In its effects it was most remarkable. But apart from the general interest of the occasion, and the memorable results to which it led, there are peculiarities in the circumstances attending this second Pentecost which may profitably engage our present consideration.

The occasion was that of the conversion of the Roman centurion, *Cornelius*, recorded in Acts 10, and again referred to with some additional statements in the next chapter. This man, then stationed with the company of soldiers under him at Cæsarea, was, of course, by birth, by education, and by his social relations, a Gentile. He had, however, been brought, in what men would call an incidental way, to see the falsity of Romish heathenism, to turn from its vain idolatry, and at heart to embrace a pure Jewish theism. But he was not a Jew, not even a proselyte. Outwardly he still remained a Roman. And yet he is declared to have been “a devout man, and one that feared God, and prayed to God always.” Thus, at least, the pen of inspiration writes of him. It is not such a description as a Priest, a Levite, or a Pharisee would have given of the man. By their standard he would probably

have been harshly condemned. But we have better testimony than theirs as to his true character, and may rely upon the estimate set upon him as correct.

From among many important facts and lessons furnished by the Apostolic report of this case, several press themselves upon our notice as worthy of special study.

The *first* is the *Pentecostal character of the occasion*. This is particularly emphasized by Peter himself. Not only, are we told, was the Holy Ghost bestowed in a miraculous manner and measure. He fell on Cornelius and his household, it is expressly declared, "*as on the disciples at the beginning*," (Chapter II: 15.) Thus the occasion is directly compared with the memorable outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the disciples in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost. The two instances are affirmed to have been similar in all essential respects. The same Spirit wrought upon, and in the Centurion and his household in Cæsarea, who had manifested His power on the disciples in Jerusalem. He wrought there in essentially the same manner. He had produced essentially the same effects. It was really another Pentecost, however widely different in regard to some of the incidental features of the occasion, or such features, at least, as the narrative plainly treats as merely incidental and subordinate. All present recognized this fact, and by their manner and utterances confirm what Peter says regarding it. It was a Pentecostal outpouring of grace, disconnected from any of those outward, formal accompaniments which were associated with the first Pentecost, either in regard to *time, place* and *mode* of operation. At the outset some disciples in Jerusalem, when they heard of it, regarded it with suspicion, and received the tidings of what had occurred with mistrust. They were still, to a greater or less extent, under the bondage of Jewish prejudices, and of legal and ritualistic notions and conceits. For this they are hardly to be excused. And yet their infirmities and mistakes in regard to the matter, were overruled for the advantage of the cause of evangelical liberty and truth. They led to the more distinct and emphatic statement of those peculiarities of the case which possess special value for the cause of true Christianity at large. They furnished an opportunity for illustrating, by *fact*, certain Gospel or evangelical principles and truths which needed such a matter-of-fact illustration, as a surer barrier, if possible, against their subsequent *utter* perversion.

Here, then, let these points be carefully noted : (1.) There is a true and most effective outpouring of the Holy Ghost, apart from any formally observed *feast-day*, any ecclesiastically fixed *time* or *season*.

(2.) It was an outpouring independent of any ecclesiastically consecrated *place*. The Spirit of Grace showed Himself as merciful and mighty away from Jerusalem and the temple, as He had done in them previously.

A *second* fact peculiar to the case, shows itself in *the character and social relations* of those upon whom this Pentecostal blessing was bestowed. Cornelius and his household were not only Gentiles. There is another feature in their case which is still more notable:

*They were unbaptized.* No sacramental water had ever touched them. No formal laver of regeneration had ever received them. No hands of apostolic benediction had ever been laid upon them. And yet the Holy Ghost fell on them "as on the disciples at the beginning."

Did He fall on those who were still under "the power of the devil?" And did they still continue under the power of Satan after the Holy Spirit had fallen upon them? Were their sins still unforgiven, and did their sins remain unforgiven, after they had received the gift of the Holy Spirit, until they were subsequently baptized? Had they not received the gift of a new and holy life, and were they made the temples of the Holy Spirit without that life?

So we must believe, if we accept the doctrine of Papists, of ultra-Lutherans, and of their sympathizing fellow disciples, the theologians of the Mercersburg-Lancaster school.

According to the doctrines zealously maintained and defended by the theologians referred to, Cornelius and his household must present the monstrous spectacle of persons endowed with the Holy Ghost, whilst still under the power of the devil, made the subjects of the power of Divine grace, whilst continuing dead in trespasses and sins; and marked as recipients of heavenly blessings, whilst yet they remained in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity.

But whoever accepts the faith of the Gospel, instead of the fancies of such errorists; whoever prefers the light of Gospel truths and facts to the gloomy lessons of Galatian troublers of the church;



and whoever accepts the evangelical doctrines of the Reformed church, instead of bending the neck to such bold perversions of its doctrines, will have no difficulty in answering the above questions.

No lack of a formal confirmatory ordinance could be a bar to the effectual operation of the Holy Ghost. He who, if He pleases, may work in connection with baptism, may also work without it. If Lancaster theologians are *bound* by their own foolish and vain speculations, He is not bound. And if they *will* keep themselves tangled by their own cords in a bondage of enslaving error, forfeiting their birthright for the pleasure of holding what they vainly imagine to be a new and more profound philosophy, it is a blessed thing that *we need not let our hands, or heads, or hearts, be tied by the same cords.*

As a *third* noteworthy point in this case, the narrative gives prominence to *the peculiar means employed* in preparing Cornelius and his household for the grace bestowed upon them.

From beginning to end these means were only and wholly what may be termed *spiritual*, in distinction from such as are formal and ceremonial. First of all, "Cornelius and all his house" were brought under various religious influences, which produced in their minds and hearts a devout reverence for God, and awakened in them the spirit of true beneficence and sincere worship. They thus became fervently pious, and with an extraordinary measure of spiritual enlightenment for Roman Gentiles.

Here, then, is seen the working of prevenient grace, (*vorlaufende Gnade.*) This grace reached and apprehended them while they yet were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise." It may be supposed, of course, that some knowledge of the truth, as Israel possessed it, had been obtained by occasional association with devout Jews of Cæsarea. But this had not led them formally to embrace Judaism, or to become proselytes of the gate by baptism or any other ceremonial act. The Holy Spirit wrought directly and spiritually upon them, through such moral methods as may have been applied. Improving the light and grace they enjoyed, they were spiritually fitted for greater measures of grace.

To this another fact is added. God was pleased to grant this awakened Gentile Cornelius a *special vision*, and in it a direct communication of a most impressive and encouraging nature (10:

3-7.) This took place without the intervention of any ecclesiastical official. There was no mediating earthly priest at hand, standing between God and Cornelius, and procuring the favor for him. As the vision occurred about the "ninth hour" (10: 3), which was an hour of prayer, it is very probable that Cornelius was engaged in *private devotions*. But that is the only formal feature connected with the case.

Thus far, then, the preparation strongly resembles that of the disciples on the *great* day of Pentecost, in being eminently spiritual and personal; or, as our Lancaster friends would say, it was *spiritualistic* and *subjective*. It seems, however, to have been the Lord's way of preparing the soul of this man and his household for the happy issue. Call it subjective, spiritualistic, pietistic, or what they please, in the way of sarcasm and reproach; *it certainly proved very effective*. And that is its best certificate.

In full agreement with these antecedents, we next find *Peter sent to preach the Gospel* to these people in their own house, and this as a special divinely ordered means of carrying on the good work begun in them. To this *method* did not Peter object? Did he not say: Must I not first of all baptize them, and after having thus disciplined them, then come with the preaching of the Word? Our Lancaster teachers declare this to be the true way, according to *their* interpretation of the great commission.

Peter, however, as well as his fellow Apostles, did not so understand the matter. He had not learned his exegesis at Lancaster. He indeed hesitated about going to Gentiles at all. His strong Jewish prejudices were in his way. But when he did go, he showed no hesitation as to the proper mode of dealing with the case.

So he simply preached. Evidently he agreed with Paul, in believing that it was God's order of grace to save men by the simplicity of preaching—a method which those wise in their own conceits, or duped by misapprehensions of ceremonialism, thought *foolishness*.

What he preached, it will be well for our readers to peruse by turning to the chapter. It is very remarkable, however, that in his whole sermon he said not one word about Baptism. But he does make a declaration in concluding his discourse, which should have deep significance for all, and especially for those who, in the face of contrary Scriptures, and in the face of opposing facts,

and most emphatically in the face of this entire narrative, are constantly striving to magnify what they call a sacramental Christianity at the expense of an Apostolic, gospel Christianity. Mark Peter's words, and let them stand out in bold relief before every honest mind and heart:

"TO HIM (Jesus) GIVE ALL THE PROPHETS WITNESS, THAT THROUGH HIS NAME, WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH IN HIM SHALL RECEIVE THE REMISSION OF SINS."

The *last* prominent point in this case we can now notice, is the *effect* which followed the delivery of this Gospel sermon: "*While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word.*"

This, surely, was the signature of the Holy Spirit to the *method* employed by Peter. Call it *magical* who dare. The effect declares the work to have been divine, and the instrumental means such as he who promised and procured the gift of the Spirit, endorsed and approved. And not until after this blessed effect had been wrought, not until after the Spirit descended upon Cornelius and his whole house, as on the disciples at the beginning, were they baptized.

No wonder that this Pentecost at Cæsarea has staggered the ingenuity and perplexed the sophistry of the advocates of the new-order theology. Well it may. A few reflections must close this article.

One of clearest marks (notæ) of a false, sacerdotal churchism, is found in its Judaizing efforts to magnify the importance of times and seasons, forms and ceremonies, and of things which are simply secondary and incidental in religion. It is the same spirit essentially which made great account of tithing, mint, anise, and cummin, whilst the weightier matters of the law were disregarded. Or, to put the matter in still another way, it is kindred with that Pharisaic punctiliousness which was most precise about the kind of dress it wore, and the breadth of the phylacteries on the dress, but showed only the slightest concern in regard to the inner ornaments of grace. The hands must be carefully washed five times a day, no matter if the heart is left as foul as a cage of unclean birds.

Or, to turn to account a statement recently made—this false churchism with its strong sacerdotal and hierarchical tendency, will tolerate a very large amount of false doctrine in the pulpit,



if only the preacher will turn his face towards its altar and closely observe its ritual. He may preach Socinianism, if he will only pray out of the book. He may be a Richelieu, or a keeper of the Pope's monkeys, if he will only do homage to the system which magnifies the Pope and his officials.

That such a false churchism should have advocates among men who have so far fallen from the primitive faith, as openly to avow their submission to the dogmas of Popes and papal councils, as above the explicit doctrines of the Bible, can be understood.

Such persons have surrendered their own consciences to what they have come to consider a superior spiritual authority, and renounced all personal responsibility in matters of faith and practice.

But there are those who virtually do all this, whilst yet professing to be evangelical Protestants. Holding and advocating views which are essentially of this Judaising Romish character, they still claim to be the truest representatives and the most learned and consistent expounders of Reformed principles in matters of faith, worship and polity. This is hard to understand and explain. At least, it is hard to do so without doing what it is unpleasant to do, viz.: reflecting either upon their intelligence or upon their integrity.

This perplexity is increased by the fact, that such persons still profess, among other things, an evangelical regard for the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures, as the ultimate rule of faith and practice. Such a profession, if sincere, binds them to accept its plain teachings, no matter how erroneously fourth and fifth century fathers, or later councils, may have interpreted them. And yet those referred to do, in fact, make such later interpretations and dogmas their rule and guide. Their position is a marvelously contradictory one, and it is no wonder that it involves them in all sorts of inconsistency and confusion, so that their writings mostly puzzle others as much as they seem to be puzzled themselves.

How much wiser and better, how much more profoundly philosophical, and in harmony with solemn vows, would it be for such to abide, in their faith and teaching, by the Word of God and the confession of their Church.

## ERROR AND ITS ADVOCATES.

It is a circumstance by no means to be overlooked, that *error* usually makes its way by subtlety and not by force. The Scriptures speak of the "*deceivableness*" of error. It is its deceivableness chiefly which constitutes its dangerousness. It is, indeed, a sad and undeniable fact, that men may be the unconscious victims of its fascinations, even while denouncing its deadly delusiveness. Error is not, as is commonly supposed, the direct opposite to truth, but a departure from the truth. The two not only start from the same point, but for a considerable distance they usually run nearly coincident or parallel, so that the deviation of the one from the other can be ascertained only by taking the angle here and there most accurately with the compasses of the Divine word and testimony. The common characteristic of error, is its *sinuosity*, by which it is made to touch, and cut, and cross continually the narrow, silvery line of truth. Even where it goes off at a tangent, never to touch the right line again, the deflection, in most cases, is so slight at first that it is not perceived; and it is only by looking in the opposite direction, after a large intervening space from the starting point, that its wide and ever widening departure from the truth can be detected.

It is then this two-fold characteristic of error, its slight deviation at first from truth and its frequent touching and crossing the line of truth, which causes it so often to deceive and, in some cases, fatally to mislead men. It is not so much by error in its abstract deformity we are in danger of being deceived, as by error disguised under some specious garb of truth. The more of truth's attractiveness there is about it, the more liable we are to be unconsciously misled. Hence, we may lay it down as a rule, *that error is dangerous just in proportion to the quantity of truth that is mixed with it.*

It is a common source of self-confidence, and consequently of danger in regard to error, to suppose that it possesses no active power. It is not by any means that cold, bare, abstract thing which men are apt to imagine, which they can receive or reject at will, like a naked proposition in mathematics. There is a *spirit* in it. It is warm with life and instinct with energy; not indeed by any inherent power of its own, but as breathed into it by its author or imagined to be in it by its beholder, so that to ven-

ture within the magic circle of its influence, is the sure way to be overcome. Error charms first, in order to deceive, and deceives by charming.

The victims who commonly become the most active propagators of error, are of two very opposite tempers according to the extremes they adopt, and will be distinguishable, generally speaking, either as being very self-opinionated and positive, or wonderfully gentle and unresisting. The person who represents the first class, will be content with nothing that is received by others, just because he fancies himself more enlightened than others. He will have a peculiar opinion of his own upon every subject, and his self-confidence in asserting it will usually be exceeded only by its absurdity. To admit a doubt, indeed, of the correctness of his own views, would be to acknowledge the possibility that his penetration was no greater than that of other men and to forfeit his whole claim to dogmatize. Whenever a question is raised or any inquiry made upon any abstruse point of theology, his answer is always ready—"It is thus *I* think. This is the very truth of God. You must receive this doctrine just in the way I state it, without the slightest doubt or modification, or you will infallibly be damned." Thus he thrusts every dogma of his own down your throat without giving you time to taste it, and then instantly places a padlock upon your lips.

The person who represents the second class, is distinguished by just the reverse of this spirit, at least *in appearance*. Whatever has always been received, he gently urges ought never to be questioned. When he would press any principle, which to you may be new, he presses it with so unassuming a modesty of tone that you can hardly resist him; and if he differs from you on any point, he will assure you, with a bland smile of the most winning attractiveness, that he does it with extreme pain and regret—"nevertheless the truth must be asserted." Supple and smooth in speech, he softly insinuates his objections to weaken your confidence in your own received notions, while, by his plausibility and apparent depth of piety, he wins the attention of the weak, weaves the spider's web of some sophistical subtlety in the way of argument, and having thus first entangled, he then entraps. If confronted by honest frankness, and charged with attempting to mislead, he meets you with a yielding resistance of affected meekness, only to vary his point of attack. Controversy he pro-



fessedly eschews, relying rather upon pensive poetic sentiment, an affected austerity and deadness to the world, and an air of high-wrought mental devotion, and an insinuating gentleness of manner. But gentle as he appears, and averse to contention, he will never hesitate to crush where he dare not encounter. His method is not to withstand an enemy openly, but to destroy him by a sly thrust.

In opposition to these two representatives of error, how different is the person who has the spirit of truth dwelling within him! He is ever open to conviction. Frank and free from all disguise in avowing the doctrines he holds, he will listen with calmness and candor to whatever may be advanced in support of an opposite system. Having no sinister objects to accomplish, he will be straight-forward without being overbearing. One of this habit of mind will take the *word of God*, and not his own fancies and prepossessions, as his guide, his sole and decisive authority, interpreted according to its plain common-sense meaning, and not squared to adapt it to any human theory. Humbly conscious of his own ignorance and liability to err, and knowing that all human beings must be equally fallible, he will look up prayerfully and patiently to the Most High for the teaching of His Spirit.

Truth, we may rest assured, carries with it a growing distinctness; and though for a time, like the blind man whose eyes Christ opened, men may appear to us but as trees walking, yet if we keep our gaze intently on it, and suffer not ourselves to be diverted by earth-born shadows, all things will at length stand out distinct and clearly defined, and we shall no longer be in danger of mistaking the *ideal* for the *real*.

E. H. N.

---

## SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

### CHAPTER XIX.

#### *Of the Sacraments of the Church of God.*

AT an early age, already, God united the sacraments, or covenant seals, with the preaching of His word, in His church. So the whole Scriptures prove. The sacraments, now, are holy

symbols, or customs, or rites, instituted of God Himself, consisting of His Word, of signs and the things signified, through which He reminds us of the greatest benefits secured to man in His church, and also renews them, and at the same time seals His promises. That which He bestows upon us inwardly, He represents outwardly, as it were, to our sight; yea, through the operation of the Holy Spirit He strengthens and increases faith in our hearts. And finally, by His sacraments He distinguishes us from all other people and sanctifies and unites us with Him alone, and shows what He demands from us.

There are sacraments of the old, and others of the new covenant. The sacraments of the old covenant were circumcision and the Paschal Lamb; under which name it was reckoned with the sacrifices which were offered from the beginning of the world. The sacraments of the new people are Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Gen. 17: 10; Ex. 12: 3; Matt. 28: 19; Mark 16: 16; Matt. 26: 26; 1 Cor. 11: 23; &c.

There are some who reckon seven sacraments of the new covenant. Of these we accept as divine and useful ordinances, but not as sacraments, the following: Repentance, ordination of ministers, (not the popish but the apostolical), and marriage. As for confirmation and extreme unction, these are human inventions, which the church can, without any injury, do without. For there be some things in them which we cannot approve. All accessories which the Romanists employ in the distribution of the sacraments, we utterly detest.

The author of the sacraments is God alone, not any man. Men cannot ordain sacraments. They belong to the worship of God, *and it is not for man to arrange and ordain the worship of God, but it is his duty to accept and preserve it as God has ordained it.* Besides, there are provisions annexed to these signs, which require faith; but faith bases itself alone upon the Word of God.

The Word of God may be compared to writing, or a letter; but the sacraments to seals, which God alone has attached to the writing. And as God is the author of the sacraments, He also works continually in that church where His sacraments are rightly used; namely, so that believers when they receive the sacrament from the hand of the minister, do know that the Lord works in His own ordinances, and they, hence, receive the sacrament from the hand of God; and the faults of the ministers (whatever they

may be) do not injure them, because they acknowledge that the integrity (or lawfulness) of the sacrament rests upon the ordination by the Lord. Thence they also carefully distinguish, in the sacraments, between the Lord and the minister; acknowledging that the substance of the sacrament is given them of the Lord, but the sanctified signs by the ministers.

The principal thing in which all the sacraments is given of God and expected by the believers of all ages, (some call it the substance and matter of the sacraments) is Christ the Redeemer, that only offering, (Heb. 10: 12;) that Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world (Rev. 13: 8), that rock also of which all our fathers drank (1 Cor. 10: 4), by whom all the elect are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands through the Holy Spirit (Col. 2: 11, 12), and are washed from their sins (Rev. 1: 5), and are nourished with the true body and blood of Christ unto eternal life (John 6: 54).

In this, the essence or matter of the sacraments, the sacraments of the old and of the new covenant are quite alike. For Christ, the only Mediator and Redeemer of believers, is in both the chief thing and matter of the sacraments; one and the same God is the author. To both people were they given as signs and seals of grace and the promises of God, which call to mind and renew His greatest benefits, and by which He at the same time distinguishes believers from other religions of the world; and lastly, that they might be received spiritually through faith, and that the recipients might be bound to His church and reminded of their duties. In these and other respects, we say that the sacraments of both people are not different, although in signs they are unlike; Luke 22: 19; 1 Cor. 11: 24; John 6: 47; Rom. 6: 3, 4; Eph. 5: 16; Acts 2: 41, 42; 1 Cor. 10: 17.

And, in truth, we also hereby affirm a greater difference between them; for ours are more firm and durable, because they shall not be changed to the end of the world. Again, they testify that the substance and the promise are fulfilled, which the former only signified as to be fulfilled. Again, ours are more simple, less painful, and connected with less expense and ceremonies. And then, also, they belong to a great people, spread over the whole earth; and since they are more excellent, and through the Holy Spirit stir up a higher faith, they also are accompanied with a richer fullness of the Spirit.



Since Christ, the true Messiah, has been given unto us, and the fullness of grace has been poured out over the people of the new covenant, the sacraments of the old covenant have been abrogated and have ceased, and in their places have been appointed the symbols of the New Testament ; in place of circumcision we have baptism, and in place of the Paschal Lamb and the sacrifices we have the Supper of the Lord.

But, as formerly, the sacraments consisted of the Lord, the signs and the thing signified, so now they also consist of the same. For it is by the Word of God that they became what they were not before, namely, sacraments. They are consecrated by the Word and set forth as sanctified by Him who instituted them.

To sanctify or consecrate anything, means to devote a thing to God and for a holy use; that is, to separate it from a common or profane use and to appoint it to a holy use.

In baptism, the sign is the element of water, and the visible washing by the minister; the thing signified, is regeneration, or the washing away of sin.

In the Lord's Supper *the signs are bread and wine, taken from things commonly used for meat and drink ; but the thing signified is the body of the Lord, which was given for us, and His blood which was shed for us, or the communion of the body and blood of the Lord.* Consequently, the water, bread and wine, considered in their own nature and apart from the divine institution and the sacred use, are only that which they are called and what by our senses we find them to be. But when there is added the Word of the Lord, with invocation of His name and the renewing of their first institution and sanctification, then these signs are consecrated and declared as sanctified of Christ.

For that first institution of Christ and His consecration of the sacraments remains effectual forever in the church ; in such part that whoever celebrates them not, otherwise than as the Lord in the beginning ordained, becomes partaker also of that first glorious consecration. Hence, at the celebration of the sacraments the Lord's own words are to be repeated Acts 2: 38. Matt. 26: 27, 28. 1 Cor. 10: 16.

And since we learn out of the Word of God that these signs have been ordained by the Lord to another end than that which they are commonly used, we teach that the name of the thing signified now also belong to them, and that they are not to be called

only water, bread and wine, but also the bath of regeneration, body and blood of the Lord, or pledges, or sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord. Titus 3: 5. 1 Cor. 10: 16. Not because the signs are changed into the things signified, and cease to be what their nature is. Then they would not be sacraments; and if they were the things signified, they would not be signs of the same. But for this reason the signs receive the names of the things signified, because they are nuptial pledges, and sacramentally combine and unite the signs and the things signified, through the nuptial signification, and the will of Him who has instituted the sacraments. He did not ordain water in baptism with this view, that believers should only be affused with the water of baptism; and when He ordained that in the supper we should partake of bread and wine, He did not will that believers should receive only bread and wine, without any mystery, as bread is eaten at home; but in order that they might also become partakers of the thing signified, and through faith become truly washed from sins and united with Christ. Then, hence we do by no means approve of it, when some ascribe the sanctity of the sacraments to certain syllables, to certain recitations, or to the power of the words pronounced by him that consecrates, or to his intention, or to some other invented thing, but which has not been given to us through Christ, nor the words or example of the apostles. We equally reject the doctrine of those who speak of the sacraments as common, but not holy and effectual signs. And those also who, for the sake of the invisible, despise the visible in the sacraments, and regard the signs as superfluons, because they imagine they have the thing signified already, as is said to have been the opinion of the Messalians. And finally, we also reject the teaching of those who affirm that grace and the benefits signified are connected with and included in the signs, so that those who merely outwardly partake of the signs become also inwardly partakers of grace and the benefits designated, be they who they may.

As we do not estimate the power of the sacraments according to the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister, so also not according to the condition of the recipients; for we recognize that this power depends upon the faithfulness, truth, and pure goodness of God.

For, like as the Word of God remains the true Word of God; as in the preaching not merely empty words are sounded forth,

but also the benefits signified through the Word are offered, although the godless and unbelievers hear and understand them but do not become partakers of the benefits, because they do not receive them in true faith; just so do the sacraments in word, signs, and things signified, remain steadfast, true and powerful, not merely signifying, but, according to God's promise, exhibiting the things signified also, although unbelievers do not receive the benefits offered. The fault lies not in God, who gives and exhibits, but in man, who receives without faith and unworthily; "whose unbelief cannot make the truth of God of more effect."

Rom. 3: 3.

Since we have now first shown what sacraments are, and for what end they have been ordained, it will not be necessary to trouble ourselves with repetitions, and we will now speak singly of the sacraments of the new covenant.

#### CHAPTER XX.

##### *Of Holy Baptism.*

Baptism has been instituted and sanctified of God. The first one who administered it, was John, who baptized Christ with water in Jordan. From him it came to His Apostles, who also baptized with water. The Lord plainly commanded them "to preach the Gospel, and to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. 28: 19). And when the Jews asked, "What must we do?" Peter answered, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," (Acts 2: 38). Hence, some have called baptism the consecration-sign of the people of God, whereby they as elect are consecrated to God. Matt. 3: 6, 16. Mark 16: 15, 16.

There is but one baptism in the church of God, and it is sufficient to be once baptized and consecrated to God. Baptism once received, continues for the whole life, and is the permanent sealing of our adoption into the family of God. For to be baptized in the name of Christ, means to be enrolled, consecrated and received with the covenant and the family, and so into the inheritance of the children of God; yea, in this life to be named with the name of God, that is, God's children; purified from the stain of sin and to be endowed with the manifold grace of God



unto a new, holy life. Baptism reminds us of, and keeps in remembrance, God's rich benefit to a dying race. For we are all born in the pollution of sin, and are the children of wrath; but God, who is rich in mercy, purifies us from sin, of pure grace, through the blood of His Son, and in Him adopts us as His children; yea, He enters into a covenant with us, enriches us with manifold gifts, so that we can walk in a new life. All this is sealed in baptism. For inwardly we become regenerated, purified and renewed through the Holy Spirit. Outwardly we receive the seal of these great gifts through the water, whereby the fullness of the benefits are set before us, and, as it were, laid before our eyes. To this end we are baptized; that is, washed or sprinkled with visible water; for water takes away the impurity, refreshes the fainting and thirsting, and cools the bodies. The grace of God, in like manner, secures benefits to the souls invisibly and in a spiritual mode. At the same time God, by the signs of baptism, distinguishes us from all strange religions and peoples, and consecrates us with Himself as His own.

When we are baptized, we confess our faith, and bind ourselves unto obedience to God, to mortify the flesh and to renew our life; and so we are enrolled among the holy soldiers of Christ, to strive for our whole lives against the world, the devil and our own flesh. Moreover, we are baptized into one body of the church, that we will stand lovingly in communion with all members of the same in one faith and mutual performance of duties. Heb. 10: 22, 23. 1 Pet. 3: 21. Ps. 51: 7. Eph. 2: 3, 4. 1 Cor. 6: 11. Tit. 3: 5, 6. Rom. 6: 2, 4. Gal. 3: 27, 28. 1 Cor. 12: 13.

We believe that that is the most perfect form of baptism, according to which Christ Himself was baptized, and which the apostles did use. That, consequently, what afterwards was added and became customary, through human invention, is not necessary for perfect baptism. To this belong exorcism, the use of lights, oil, salt, spittle, and such like things; yea, so that baptism is celebrated twice every year with diverse ceremonies. For we believe that one baptism has been, by divine ordinance, sanctified and consecrated in the church, through the Word, and is now of full force through the first blessing.

We teach that baptism must not be administered in the church by women, or midwives. For Paul (in 1 Cor. 14: 34) excluded the women from the church ministrations. But baptism belongs to the office of the church.

*Attraction of Romanism for Uneasy Protestants.* 287

We reject the Anabaptists, who deny that young infants, children of believers, are to be baptized. For, according to the Evangelical doctrine, "Theirs is the Kingdom of God," (Luke 18: 16), and they are in the covenant of God; why then should the sign of the covenant be refused to them? Why should they not be consecrated by baptism; seeing they are God's and in the church? We condemn the Anabaptists also, in the other special doctrines which they hold against the Word of God. We are not Anabaptists, and do not agree with them in any of their peculiar doctrines.

---

ATTRACTION OF ROMANISM FOR UNEASY PROTESTANTS.

BY JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE.

ARTICLE II.

[The *Christian Intelligencer*, of New York, well-known as the able representative of the Reformed Dutch Church among religious periodicals, is adding to its other attractions by publishing a series of articles from the pen of the distinguished historian, *Froude*. As Mr. Froude is bringing the weight of his historical learning to bear against Popery, he has been, of course, made the target of fierce attacks by Papists. Among other magical arts, Jesuits claim the power of reorganizing history, changing past events to suit their ends. Mr. F. reads and reports history as it is. With what telling effect our readers may judge from the following article which we copy from the *Christian Intelligencer*.]

Religion differs from moral science in the authority with which it speaks. Moral science addresses the reason, and is contented with probabilities. It indicates what, on the whole, after the examination of the evidence, appear to be the ethical conditions under which human beings exist upon the planet. Religion, on the other hand, speaks with command, and corresponds to the laws of the State. The law lays down a set of rules, and says to every man, "Conform to these, or you will be punished." Religion lays down a set of doctrines, and says, "Believe these at your soul's peril." A certain peremptoriness being thus of the

essence of the thing, those religious teachers will always command most confidence who dare most to speak in positive tones. Assertions hesitatingly expressed or qualified with modest reserve, may suit the lecture-room or the study, but they are out of place in the pulpit. An eager, heavy-laden soul crying out from its heart, "What must I do to be saved?" will listen only to a preacher who shows that he believes himself with all his energy in the answer which he gives. It is no secret that of late years Protestant divines have spoken with less boldness, with less clearness and confidence than their predecessors of the last generation. They are not to be blamed for it. Their intellectual position has grown in many ways perplexed. Science and historical criticism have shaken positions which used to be thought unassailable. Doctrines once thought to carry their own evidence with them in their inherent fitness for man's needs, have become, for some reason or other, less conclusively obvious. The state of mind to which they were addressed has been altered—altered in some way either for the worse or the better. And where the evangelical theology retains its hold, it is rather as something which it is wrong to doubt, than as a body of living truth which penetrates and vitalizes the heart.

Thus where truth was once flashed out like lightning attended with oratorical thunders, it is now uttered with comparative feebleness. The most honest, perhaps, are the most uncomfortable and most hesitating, while those who speak most boldly are often affecting a confidence which in their hearts they do not feel. At the time of the revolt from Rome, and for a century after it, the characteristic of a Protestant was his hatred of falsehood. The ingenious sophistry which would make a proposition at once false and true, false in one aspect, and true in another, was a snare of Satan to be trampled upon and detested. Truth was truth, to be loved beyond all earthly or unearthly things. Lies were lies, and all the philosophy in the world could not make them cease to be lies, or make an honest mind put up with them. Had Protestant preachers the ancient courage, they might still display this, the noblest aspect of their characters. But from some cause, it seems they dare not speak, they dare not think like their fathers. Too many of them condescend to borrow the weapons of their adversaries. They are less looking for what is true than for arguments to defend positions which they know to be indefensible. Their



*Attraction of Romanism for Uneasy Protestants.* 289

sermons are sometimes sophistical, sometimes cold and mechanical, sometimes honestly diffident. Any way, they are without warmth, and cannot give what they do not possess.

The Romanist has availed himself of the opportunity. Every difficulty which troubles his rival, if he cared in the same sense for truth, ought to trouble him still more; but he has long since confounded truth with the affirmations of what he calls the church. The Protestant, finding three centuries ago that the institution called the church was teaching falsehood, refused to pin his faith upon the church's sleeve thenceforward. He has relied upon his own judgment, and times come when he is perplexed. The Romanist, in fancied triumph over him, points to his infallible authority. "See," he says, "what comes of schism. The church is the appointed guide. The church alone guarantees to us the existence of God or of the soul. Believe with us or be atheists; there is no alternative." In the Hindoo legend, the world stands on the back of an elephant, the elephant on a tortoise. We ask where the tortoise stands, and we get no answer. Similarly, we ask the Romanist where his church stands. "It stands," he says, "on Peter, and Peter upon Christ." That is, stripped of verbiage, it stands precisely on the same foundation on which the Protestant religion stands—on the truth of the Gospel history. Before we can believe the Gospel history, we must appeal to the consciousness of God's existence, which is written on the hearts of us all. There is no real alternative between the Catholic church and atheism, for the Catholic has no evidence of the being of God which is not common to every other Christian—none of the truths of the Gospel narrative but such as the Protestant shares with him. But his church stands as a visible thing, which appears to the imagination as well as the reason. The vexed soul, weary of its doubts, and too impatient to wait till it pleases God to clear away the clouds, demands a certainty on which it can repose—never to ask a question more. By an effort of will, which, while claiming the name of faith, is in reality a want of faith, it seizes the Catholic system as a whole. Foregoing the use of the natural reason forevermore, it accepts the words of a spiritual director as an answer to every difficulty, and finds, as it supposes, the peace for which it longed, as the body which is drugged with opium ceases to feel pain.

The convert, if he has been brought up a Protestant, asks for

an interpretation of this or that doctrine which he had heard condemned as idolatrous; of this or that historical event, where the church had seemed to have acted as inspired, not by God, but by the devil. The director meets him with a confident assertion, that Protestant tradition is based on lying; that the church was always tolerant and loving; that the tyranny and ferocity were with the sects which had broken from her communion. Prepared by his emotional sympathies to welcome the explanation, the convert listens willingly, satisfies his remaining scruples with books put into his hands, the truth of which he greedily assumes, and his dissatisfaction with the creed from which he has separated, deepens into resentment and hatred.

To no purpose afterward is evidence laid before such a man—evidence which would pass for conclusive in a court of justice—that the Protestant traditions were, after all, true; that history remains where it was; that the lying is on the side of the new teachers. He chooses to think otherwise. He no longer reasons, but feels. Opinions adopted through the emotions are thenceforward inaccessible to argument. Excited by his new position, he throws himself ardently into the devotional exercises which the church prescribes, and the zeal of which he is conscious becomes a fresh proof to him that he has really found the truth.

A Protestant, from the nature of things, comes in contact with the Catholic system in its most seductive form. Where it has been in power, it has shown its real colors. It has been lazy, sensual and tyrannical. It has alienated every honest mind in Spain and Italy, just as three centuries ago it alienated the forefathers of those who are now returning to its bosom. In Protestant countries where it is in opposition, it wears the similitude of an angel. It is energetic and devoted; it avoids scandal; it appeals to toleration, and, therefore, pretends to be itself tolerant. Elsewhere it has killed the very spirit of religion, and those who break from it believe nothing. Evangelicalism has kept alive a spirit of piety and hunger for the knowledge of God. The Catholic missionaries make their market out of feelings which, but for the Protestantism which they denounce, would have ceased to exist, and find easy victims in those whose emotional temperament is stronger than their intellect or their faith.

Trials there have always been, and always will be, intellectual as well as moral. Our business, when they overtake us, is to bear

them. We may not immediately see our way out of a difficulty. Belief will keep our conviction unshaken that there are explanations which we do not see ourselves. To go over to an alien church, because for a moment some evidence on which we had relied in our own seems less strong than we had supposed is, when rightly looked at, mere cowardice and treason against our own souls.

How far these conversions may go it is impossible to say. This only can be foretold with certainty that, if by this or any other cause the Catholic church anywhere recovers her ascendancy, she will again exhibit the detestable features which have invariably attended her supremacy. Her rule will be once more found incompatible either with justice or with intellectual growth, and our children will be forced to recover by some fresh struggle the ground which our forefathers conquered for us, and which we by our pusillanimity surrendered.

---

#### REGENERATION BY BAPTISM.

AMONG the most painful and vexatious experiences of Evangelical Christianity in our day, is the necessity of contending continually against old errors renewed, and of resisting attempts to bring the church under the bondage of a false and hurtful ritualism. And the annoyance of this necessity is greatly increased by the fact, that such efforts are often made by persons from whom better things might be expected, and by ways and means which are not thought reputable even among "secular politicians" of the nobler sort.

Assaults from the world, or from those who openly avow antagonism to evangelical truth, are to be expected, and should be met with firm composure. But when foes to the faith spring up in the household, when the foundation, of a church are undermined by those who should be watchmen on her walls, and keepers of her citadels, it is enough to provoke indignation and rouse every loyal sentiment to a prompt and uncompromising suppression of the wrong.

Nothing so much as this seemed to excite the displeasure of



Paul. He could rather patiently endure the malice and rage of openly hostile Jews and Gentiles. He could glory in the affliction heaped upon him by such hands. But when he comes to speak of certain "false brethren unawares (secretly and insidiously) brought in, who came in principally to spy out the liberty of Christians (that is their freedom from the fetters of ritualism), that they might bring them again into bondage," he seems to think it beyond endurance, and to feel tempted almost to wish them "cut off, that so troubled" the church. (Galatians 2: 4, 5; 5: 12).

These are not times when Christians should be contending among themselves over matters of faith and practice long since settled, and fairly and fully settled. Controversy may be unavoidable; and when waged against those without who openly assail the truth, it may be profitable. But there is no excuse for those who, by their vain yet dangerous speculations, and by specious endeavors to revive and restore exploded errors in a church, excite warfare within her borders, and distract her peace by rendering it necessary warmly to resist the attempt, in order to maintain and preserve the purity of her faith and practice. Such controversies turn the energy and zeal of those forced into them from the better work of building up and extending Christianity, to the excitement and struggles of conflict. Time, strength and talents, which might and should be devoted to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the seeking and saving of the lost, must be spent in contentions with internal disturbers of the peace of the church, and employed in putting down threatening seditions. Those who should toil hand in hand, and heart to heart, for the furtherance of common evangelical interests, are arrayed against each other in angry feuds, or hindering each other in personal struggles.

It is not easy to see how such controversies between those who should be laboring with harmonious zeal in support, advancement or defence of a common cause, can be commended or palliated. God may and *will* overrule the offences given for good, in the end. But woe unto those by whom the offences come. It is not to their credit that they are so overruled.

To how sad an extent all this applies to our own branch of the Evangelical Protestant Church, is but too well known by all acquainted with her history for the last twenty or twenty-five years.

The period has been one of most unhappy and injurious strife and distraction. A few leading minds, made restive by their own speculations, and becoming more and more dissatisfied with the established faith and practice of the church, endeavored materially to change that faith and practice, and to introduce innovations, in both respects, corresponding with the strange theological and other notions they had adopted. This, naturally and properly, called forth opposition, although for a time nearly the entire ministry of the church was deceived and misled by the specious manner in which the revolutionary movement was started and defended. In proportion, however, as its true nature and aims were developed, the strength of the opposition to it increased, until now a large majority of the ministers of the church, and nearly the entire membership, are decidedly hostile to the movement, so far as it is understood, and are more determined than ever to stand by and to maintain the old faith. Indeed, but for the fact that the innovating errors have had the institutions of the church East under their control, and have used them for purposes of indoctrination and propagation, under the guidance and influence of such as have held positions of prominence and power, it is altogether probable that they would have fallen dead from the lips or pens of those who might have advanced and advocated them.

That the movement is meeting with a very decided check, is manifestly felt by its chief abettors, and causing them keen anxiety. This is betrayed by recent manœuvres, and by the peculiar tactics employed to recover lost ground, and, if possible, make sure of the future. How far the "cunning devices" may succeed, time will show.

One of the fundamental errors revived and advocated by the leaders of the movement referred to, viz: The Professors at Lancaster, and their more zealous followers, is that of

*Baptismal Regeneration.*

They have taught and maintained it in many articles, as an essential dogma of their scheme and school. Quite recently again their views upon the subject have attracted some special attention, through an article in the *Mercersburg Review*, by Rev. W. Rupp, of Berlin. Mr. Rupp advances nothing new for his party on the subject; he simply repeats, as to matter, argument, and illustra-

tion, what others of the same school have often said before. But he differs, as a writer, from most of his associates, in the comparative clearness of his style, and intelligible directness of his assertions. He is evidently, also, most sincere and earnest in holding the particular view he advocates. Often his theory blears his vision, and misleads his judgment, in the interpretation and application of Scripture passages. But his essay is remarkably free from sophism and evasions, such as so often mar the productions of other Lancaster pens, and by which he himself has been manifestly beguiled.

With one feature of his article we were particularly pleased. It evinces *loyalty of heart* to the apostolic faith, as taught in the Scriptures, and to the faith of the Reformed church as set forth in her standards, even though his mind has been captivated by the false views learned at the feet of his Gamaliel. He desires to be genuinely Reformed, and hence struggles hard to believe, and to persuade others to believe, that the doctrine he defends is Reformed and Scriptural.

As his article called forth, quite naturally, some criticisms in our worthy cotemporary, the *Christian World*, and elsewhere, Dr. Fisher, of the *Messenger*, unfortunately for himself, was drawn out in an attempted defence of Mr. Rupp's dissertation. It was an awkward thing for one who does not understand the first principles of the Mercersburg theology, and whose whole theological being moves in an utterly different sphere, to undertake such a defence. And bungling work did he make of it, exposing his ignorance of the real points at issue, by an effort to harmonize a theology which boasts of being profoundly new, with the theology of the Reformed church for three centuries.

Seeing the dilemma of the Editor of the *Messenger*, and yet feeling thankful for his kind intentions, Mr. Rupp came to the rescue both of the Editor and himself, and in a series of articles published in that paper, endeavored more fully to vindicate what he had written in the *Review*.

Thus the whole subject is fairly before us, and we propose to examine it not only in the light of Mr. Rupp's articles, but of others which have issued from the same side. In order to do this most satisfactorily, we shall adopt the following method:

I. Show, as definitely as possible, what the Mercersburg doctrine of regeneration by Baptism is.



- II. That this Mercersburg doctrine is contrary to the Holy Scriptures ;
- III. That it is radically at variance with the faith of the Reformed church ; and,
- IV. That it involves most serious consequences.

*The New Theological Doctrine,*

concerning Regeneration by Baptism, claims first attention. What do Drs. J. W. Nevin, Higbee, Gans, Apple, Gerhart, and others of that school or party, hold and teach on the subject? Taking them at their own words, and in what they claim as the sense of those words, to what do their views amount?

The importance of determining this at the outset is obvious. Unless this is done, we might do as they so often do, fight with the shadows, and chase only phantoms. Or, by going forward in the discussion without precisely fixing what the new-order party holds in their own words, they might turn and say that they had been misrepresented, and did not hold the errors imputed to them.

Besides, there are some who sympathize with Nevinism, and uphold it, who do not know or believe that it holds the errors which it advocates, although those errors may have been boldly set forth and maintained by some of its leading disciples. Thus, some time ago, Dr. Apple (T. G.) declared that he was a Lutheran of the Iowa-Fritschel stamp, on the doctrine of baptism, and yet some of his friends will not believe it.

It will help us in ascertaining the real truth in this case to remember at the outset, one fact, viz.: that this whole movement has claimed to be something new, and materially different from what is distinctively Reformed. We are aware that this claim is kept in the background, and that some writers of the party, like Mr. Rupp, are trying to show that their views agree with Reformed standards. This, however, has been done only since it has been found, by Dr. Gerhart, for instance, that the claims of novelty proves to be no recommendation of the movement. But the simple fact is, that it has been often made its chief boast, that the theology of Mercersburg is new for our church, more profound, more philosophical, more learned, more churchly than any ever known among us. Now if it is all this, then we must take it, and study or criticise it as such, in spite of all of Dr. Fisher's amiable

attempt to palm it off on his innocent readers as only our old Reformed faith in a new and improved dress.

*The Root of the Error.*

Fairly to understand what these theologians hold in regard to regeneration and baptism, we must go back and down to the root of their system. This root is found in their theory of redemption, if, indeed, it may not be traced even back of that, to a (theosophic) false view of the relation of the Creator to the creature, especially of God to man, which is so like pantheism, (the error which teaches that all things are but an outgrowth or expansion of the nature and substance of God) that it is hard to use any real difference between the two. Thus Mr. Rupp says: "That life-breath which God breathed into Adam when he became a living soul, *cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God.*" This is rather plain language to come from a minister of an Evangelical church; but the doctrine is simply that of his school, and both Dr. Nevin and Dr. Gerhart endorsed it at the Lancaster ovation. The only sense it can bear is, that man sprang from the very substance of the Godhead, and was literally a part of that substance, just as the soul of a child, to use Mr. Rupp's comparison, springs from the souls of its parents, and is an emanation from them.

Now, through the introduction of sin into the human race, this God substance which made up the inmost or central life of man as a living soul, became corrupted and depraved. Hence, man's salvation or redemption must consist in imparting to him a new measure of the divine substance. There must be a fresh emanation from the essence or the being of God, flowing over into man, by some means or other, and this must constitute the germ, root, or basis of his new life in God. Man's redemption, therefore, is effected by his regeneration in this manner and form. Regeneration is a new emanation from the substance of God, through the theanthropic, that is, God-man, nature of Jesus Christ.

That this statement fairly and truly sets forth the radical error of Mercersburg theology, or, in a word, Nevinism, will appear from the following quotations, from which the founder and disciples of the school are allowed to speak for themselves:

*Proof Passages.*

In citing these proofs from the writings of our new theology ad-

vocates, there shall be no "tearing of sentences from their connection," and no perversion of their intended sense. And we protest at the outset against any evasion of the damaging force of the passages quoted, by charging them with being misrepresentations of the author's meaning.

1. We begin with citations from what Mr. Rupp has written, as the latest declarations of the school on the subject. Defining regeneration, he says: "Regeneration is a change, not primarily in the sphere of consciousness, *but in the substance of life.*"

In this sense he further asserts: "By regeneration we understand *the implantation* of a principle of new life in the substantial centre of the human soul." Again: "Regeneration is an act of the Holy Ghost by which a principle of new spiritual life (something *objective and real*) is lodged *in the substantial centre of human personality.*"

This, he says, is what he meant by the passages in the *Review* article which have been (and deservedly) criticised, especially by a writer in the *Christian World*, signing himself Helveticus and who evidently is master of the subject.

Mr. Rupp had, however, asserted this in almost the same words in his *Review* article (as on p. 147): "Regeneration is the production or *origination* of a principle of new life in the substantial core of human personality." And again, in further explanation, he adds (p. 151): "The life of regeneration *is an emanation* by the Holy Ghost, from *Christ's divine human life.*" This that emanates, Mr. R. says, indeed, is "no sensible or material part of his *personal being.*" But this added clause must not be allowed to conceal his meaning as to what it is, in his sense, viz.: a real *substantial emanation from Christ's divine human life.*

In passages like these the peculiar phraseology (terminology) of the Nevinite school, may prevent most readers from catching their meaning. Hence, as already stated, the necessity of going to the root of their theory. Read and understood in the sense of that theory, Mr. R.'s assertions mean simply this: that *regeneration is the implantation or the infusion of a substantial portion of the divine-human life (or theanthropic nature, which is also a phrase of his school) into the substantial centre or core of our human personality.*

We cheerfully allow him to add, that this is not done "in such a way that His (Christ's) own being would be diminished by the process." This qualification, however, does not alter at all the



import of his statement. It simply asserts, that whilst "*a part of Christ's personal or individual being is, by regeneration, infused into His people,*" (his own words,) it is done without loss to Christ's personality.

That this, in its strongest literal sense, is what he means, he shows by an illustration employed, (p. 151), viz.: that of the power or influence which goes out from the natural sun, and lodges itself in the life of vegetables. So, he says, these issues from the divine-human life of Christ, as the sun of righteousness, not simply a power, grace, which works effectively upon the inmost life of the regenerated person, but "*a new spiritual principle (a substantial emanation, remember) of life, which lodges itself in the centre of the soul, and so effects what is done. 'This is regeneration,'*" according to Mr. Rupp. And "*the objective medium, or instrumental cause of (this) regeneration is,* he says, the sacrament of baptism.

Here, then, two things are affirmed, and to be carefully noted in their distinction (logical) from each other, and in their connection with each other: (1.) Regeneration is the infusion, implantation, into the soul of a new life-substance, a new substantial centre of personality; and,

(2.) The channel through which new life-substance, or substantial emanation passes over into the soul, the objective medium and instrumental cause of it, is baptism.

And *this* is the doctrine which Mr. R. and the school he represents in this case, says is (1) revealed in the Scriptures, (2) maintained by the church fathers, and (3) taught in the Heidelberg Catechism, and by all the leading older Reformed Confessions and theologians.

Let this now be kept firmly and definitely in hand. Let no one permit himself to be led off from the position thus taken, by vague and ambiguous confoundings of this theory with the good old doctrine of *sacramental grace*, into which Mr. R. and other writers of the school often glide with unconscious simplicity and facility, as though sacramental grace could mean nothing else but the absurd, unphilosophical, unscriptural, and really unchurchly, materialistic fancy above set forth.

Meanwhile, however, the better to understand what the terms and phraseology which Mr. Rupp has been led to adopt, imports, and the more fully to prove our point regarding it, we give:

2. Quotations from earlier writers on the same side, and bearing on the same subject.

The reader will please bear in mind what was stated a few pages back, viz.: that this Nevinite doctrine of regeneration grows out of its theory of redemption, and is meant to show how redemption is applied to the race.

Redemption, then, according to Nevinism, is effected in man "by an *organic conjunction* with the Saviour, in a way that makes Him to be the actual life principle of their new Christian being, and shows their life to be mysteriously involved in His from its commencement to its close." "Religion to be real, must be in some way a *community of life with God*," "an *inward conjunction in a real way*," "an incorporation of this higher element (the God-man nature of Christ) into the actual onflowing life of the world;" "a movement on the part of God in the bosom of humanity, taking hold on the depths of our human existence in the most real historical way." "The two creations (that is, the first and the second regeneration) are exhibited throughout as organically joined together in His (Christ's) person."

In full accordance with this theory, and as a further explanation of it, it is asserted that "Christianity is only another name for the divine-human life of Christ." In the literal, materialistic sense above set forth, under the term "organic conjunction," it is further declared that "Christianity is a new order of life, which is (organically, remember) comprehended primarily in the person of Christ, and which starts forth from Him as its original principle and root."

No wonder that those who adopt this theory of redemption should hold and teach (as Dr. Gerhart has done in Tract No. 3, published in the *Monthly* for November, 1870), that "all the benefits of Christ are received, *not by faith*, not through previous knowledge of our misery, not in the way of repentance and faith, *but through baptism*, and *through baptism exclusively*;" and further, that "there is no way in which a man can be created anew by the Spirit, according to the established economy of salvation, but by baptism."

To these citations we add, as a curiosity, exhibited by the New York *Independent* to its readers, the following, from the pen of the Rev. J. Beck, of Easton: Baptism "is, in a few words, the implantation of the germ or principle of a new and spiritual life from

Christ, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, brought to pass in connection with the proper use of the outward sign."

Summing all up, then, we get the following points as included in the doctrine of the new-order school :

1. Redemption or salvation is the organic conjunction in a real, substantial way, of God, through the (falsely assumed) theanthropic nature of Christ, with humanity, by implanting or infusing into humanity the divine-human substance of the God-man (Christ) as a new germ, centre, or core of man's personal life.

2. This implantation or infusion is regeneration.

3. This regeneration is effected through baptism, as the channel or medium of the infusion.

Now the question before us is :

(1.) *Not* whether *any* grace is objectively offered in baptism, or in general, in the sacraments. We all hold that there is.

(2.) *Not* whether regeneration may not take place in connection with baptism. We all hope that it may.

*But* (1) is this Nevinite *theory of regeneration* scriptural—is it the doctrine of the true church of all times; and is it the faith taught in Reformed standards? and,

(2) Is the sacrament of baptism the medium, channel, instrumental cause of such regeneration?

Again, we ask, that the discussion may be held rigidly and closely to these definite points, without evasion or ambiguity.

---

THE REV. DR. GEORGE C. SEIBERT, editor of the American Tract Society's German weekly, the *Deutscher Volksfreund*, asks for \$5000 to place that paper free in every German saloon, barber-shop and coffee-house, where it will be received and read by thousands. It meets the arguments of Buchner, whose "gospel of brutality" is summed up in these three positions: 1. That we are the descendants of brutes. 2. We are civilized animals. 3. We return, in death, to the dust of the earth. Dr. Seibert, who is a truly earnest and learned man, says that this man's books are circulated all over this country, partly free of expense, and that by their influence every spark of religious life is extinguished in hundreds of German hearts.



## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

[WE continue the publication of addresses delivered at the anniversaries of our two Literary Societies. The first one is by a member of the Zwinglian Society. By way of variety, and as a matter of interest to our friends, it has been thought well to publish the German orations delivered at the last two anniversaries, the former by a member of the Schaff Society, and the latter by a member of the Zwinglian Society. They will serve as a practical proof of the attention paid in our College to the cultivation of the German language.]

### GOD IN HISTORY.

ALL the nations of the world having a common origin and destiny, from one family, and the different periods of history are so many stages of one and the same life of this family, of the life of the human race. This life of mankind, however, is not the life of a race of agents as uncontrolled as they are unaccountable, but is the progressive unfolding, the development of mankind, according to a vast and infinitely wonderful plan, every portion of which is precisely fitted to the period it is destined to occupy, and according to which this life is regulated and its activity directed to a certain end, the destiny of mankind. It is a plan which requires the divine mind to devise it, and divine power, wisdom, justice and love to carry it out. A plan, that has for its end the highest development of man, to the honor and glory of God.

All the facts and events which constitute any period of history, tend to the progress of mankind. The wars and revolutions of antiquity, no less than the rise of great men, led to the progress of the ancients. Some wars and revolutions, as that of the Greeks against the Persians, improved the social condition, and thus led

to a higher civilization. Others, as the Roman conquest of Greece, spread intellectual cultivation, and in this way led to the further progress of mankind.

Thus the plan could be traced in the history of the ancients, according to which their activity was regulated and directed to their development, to the progress of the human race.

This plan is not as evident, however, in the middle ages. This dark period of history in which the Roman Empire crumbled to the dust, and the ancient civilization was destroyed, seems to declare that history is without a fixed plan and a definite end. And yet, in all this apparent chaos, the fine machinery of order can be traced, according to which the facts and events of history constitute a grand and glorious whole. This period of barbarism was the necessary consequence in the development of the human race of the antiquity. For in it were developed the principles of *the brotherhood of humanity, human liberty, and the respect for woman*. These were not known in the ancient world. The Greeks and Romans considered all other nations as composed of inferior beings. The whole world, outside of Greece, was to the Greek a barbarian waste. And after Rome had conquered the world, it left nothing but *Roman* citizens and *Roman* slaves. Woman was a drudge among the Romans, and not much more among the Greeks. What was called liberty among the ancients, was rather the enslavement of the individual man. While it furnished political rights, it trampled upon *human* rights. The personality of man was entirely disregarded in antiquity. He was nothing but the slave of the State.

*These principles distinguish our civilization from, and raise it far above, that of the ancients. The destruction of the Roman Empire and centuries of anarchy were necessary for their development and for the progress of the human race.* Why was not the introduction of Grecian civilization into Persia and India, by Alexander, a progress of mankind? How was it that after some time these nations again returned to the semi-barbarous state in which Alexander had found them? It was because the people had merely been subdued. Their sentiments and inner nature remained unchanged, and hence their customs, laws and religion soon prevailed over the conquerors and over the civilization which had been forced upon them, and was not their natural development. For despotically ruled States, there is no remedy but destruction. Should the Ger-

man in Gaul not degenerate into a Roman, as the Greek in Babylon had degenerated into a Persian, should humanity, as a whole, make progress, that Roman civilization which had sunk humanity in an unnatural and enervating rest, which had smothered in effeminate slavery all the most active powers of mankind, must be destroyed so as to render its imitation impossible, and the barbarians who occupy the scene, as yet uncorrupted by the riches and effeminacy of Rome, must in every respect remain the stronger party. The ancient principles which are good must, under a new form, become their possession, and from these as a basis new principles must be developed, which, perfectly unfolded, will constitute the highest intellectual moral and social development of the human race, the realization of the idea of humanity, the universal and complete civilization of the world. Principles, however, for whose development centuries of dissolution and anarchy were necessary. This is evident from the principle of human liberty. Human liberty, including both personal and political life, which is the foundation and basis of the present development of man, advances as the nation among which it prevails becomes more developed, for it is founded on *reason and moral principle*. The reverse was true with what may be called the liberty of the ancients. This was merely political, and prevailed more when in a semi-barbarous state and in times of war and revolution, than when society had become settled, and in times of peace and prosperity. (For in a semi-barbarous state, and in periods of dissolution, they enjoyed absolute personal independence; that liberty, if it may be so called, which puts no restraint on the passions and appetites of man.) In proportion as they advanced in culture, they became less free, and when the ancient world had attained the zenith of its cultivation, it had also arrived at the height of despotic power. A fixed state of society is a necessary condition for culture; but this deprived the ancients of their liberty, for it alone came with despotism, and hence they acquired their culture at the price of their liberty. Should the human race attain a higher development, a development in which the highest liberty of man is found, a liberty which goes hand in hand with culture, a settled state of society must be obtained from another source than despotism. It must be obtained by *laws which respect the rights of man*. But the origin of such laws pre-supposes a certain degree of intellectual and moral development, and man can only be brought to adopt



them by a knowledge and experience of their benefits, or of the bad consequences of lawlessness. The former supposes the existence of that which is yet to be attained, hence, only from the bad consequences of lawlessness could man be induced to adopt those laws which will increase the settled state of society necessary for a high stage of cultivation. But lawlessness, generally, passes over into arbitrary power or despotism, before sufficient intellectual and moral development has been attained to originate such laws, and it prohibits this development itself. Therefore, if these laws should be found, *the period of lawlessness must be lengthened, and there must be some influence by which this lawlessness is sufficiently checked to allow some intellectual and moral development.* This was the case during the middle ages. No single form of government could prevail during this period to the exclusion of all the others, and for centuries there was continual confusion and disorder in society. Yet we see how the state of society gradually improved. Immediately after the destruction of the Roman Empire we find nothing but savage individualism and brute force prevailing. But, after some time, this most extreme state of lawlessness is restrained by the means of the spread of Christianity among the barbarians. This religion gradually overcomes the sentiment of absolute personal independence, develops man's moral nature and thus greatly improves his social condition. It taught the barbarian that all men are his brethren, that he must not live for himself alone, but, also, for their good, and thus gave rise to the idea of humanity. While society was kept in a continual ferment during this period from internal and external causes, even this served to improve its condition. So the crusades, which agitated Europe two hundred years, and emptied it of a million of its sons, introduced into it oriental learning and refinement, gave the first impulse to commerce, and awakened a strong national feeling. Thus while lawlessness, although it still prevailed, was more and more restrained, mankind acquired the intellectual and moral development which at length gave rise to those laws which brought society to a settled state, the necessary condition for higher culture; laws which respect the rights of man; and thus the principle of human liberty was developed. In this way we see how the middle ages were necessary for the development of the great principle of human liberty, which is founded upon and involves the principle of the brotherhood of humanity;

we see how this period was necessary for the development and progress of the human race. Mankind during the ancient world, had attained the development it was destined to reach, and now ancient civilization, as the seed which contained the germ of an immeasurably superior development, had to decay, and this germ required centuries of anarchy and dissolution to expand into the tender blade which came forth so nobly in the sixteenth century. It is in this, especially, that we recognize the hand of a higher power, regulating and directing the life of mankind to its own welfare, according to an infinitely great and wonderful plan such as only the mind of God could conceive.

The progress of mankind during the last three centuries, was the continual unfolding of those principles which the middle ages were necessary to originate. These, yet in their infancy, came forth in their youthful vigor and vitality in the reformation of the sixteenth century, which freed the mind of man from those fetters in which a selfish and base hierarchy had enchained it. From this time to the present day there was continual progress, intellectual and moral, of the individual and of society. The thirty years' war, the revolutions in England, the revolution of France, were the great advancements of the great principles of human liberty and equality. These unfolded themselves more fully in the establishment of our Republic, and still more grandly in the abolition of slavery. All this, with the almost unbounded intellectual development caused by the right of free inquiry, the boon of the Reformation to mankind, and the spread of Christianity, and of all this knowledge and refinement over a large part of the world, has brought the human race to its present high state of development.

When we thus review the history of the world, and see how the events and facts which constitute it, condition and supplement each other, and all tend to the same end—the progress or the development of mankind—must we not recognize in this, *design* and *a plan*, such as only the infinite mind could conceive?

And is this plan not as wonderful as that evident everywhere in the machinery of nature, and yet, by far, superior to it? For in nature we see matter acted upon by a blind force, which acts according to certain fixed laws to insure certain results. But in history there is a race of intelligent and free moral agents, acting the most diversely, and, it would seem, the most injuriously to their common welfare; whose activity, nevertheless, *results* in promot-

ing this welfare. Do we not see in this the workings of some supreme being ruling the world and overruling the activity of man for his own good? And who else can this be but the God whom the Bible tells us created the heavens and the earth, and man in His own image?

Yes, history is truly the manifestation of God in time; for this plan, which has reference to the development of mankind, what else is its end but *the Christianization of the world*? To this end the children of Israel were selected from all the nations of the world; and to them alone did God reveal Himself, so that in them, as its representatives, mankind should be prepared for the great revelations of God—the advent of Jesus Christ, the introduction of Christianity into the world. And when mankind attained the highest intellectual cultivation, and with all this cultivation the greatest philosophers of the age, after the labors of a lifetime, despaired of the solution of the great and most important problems—what is man's origin, and what is his destiny—when all faith had been lost in the ancient mythology, and the most fearful moral depravity had taken the place of the former virtue, at this period, when earnest and thoughtful men felt the need of the intervention of a higher power to prevent the ruin of humanity, the fullness of time had come. Jesus Christ entered the world, solved those problems at which the greatest minds had stranded, furnished the key to all the seeming contradictions in the physical and moral world, made man's life joy and happiness, and his death the transition to a glorious immortality. Jesus Christ is *the* God in history, the centre around which all history revolves. As all previous ages prepared the way for His coming, all subsequent times will be the development and spread of the religion He introduced into the world. This religion, that originated with a man who had not where to lay His head, and which twelve poor fishermen started to establish in this world, spread with wonderful rapidity through the civilized world, in opposition to the prejudices, the pride and the terrible persecution of the times, superseded all the curious fabrics of Pagan philosophy, and scarcely three hundred years after the death of its founder it established itself triumphantly on the ruins of Paganism. It brought the great principle of the brotherhood of humanity into the world; at the dissolution of the Roman Empire it preserved the ancient writings from destruction, civilized the barbarian, and during the middle



ages it produced that morality which was necessary for the development of the principle of human liberty. Thus Christianity has given birth to two principles which distinguish modern from ancient civilization. It is the central stream of civilization. In the middle ages all intellectual progress, all the great political and national movements were originated by it. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, which has been so beneficial to the intellectual and moral progress of mankind, was but its further development. The last three centuries show the development and spread of Christianity, always accompanied by a progress of civilization. The Christian religion is to-day the chief support of the harmony, the domestic happiness, the morals and the intellectual improvement of the best part of the world. It is continually spreading, making the fiercest savages as gentle and submissive as children, inspiring within them hopes of an immortality of bliss, organizing them into society, and displacing their savage customs and manners by those of civilized life.

Thus we see that the spread and development of Christianity results in the development and progress of the human race—that the development of mankind previous to the introduction of this religion was preparatory to it; in other words, Christianity is *the fact* of history in which all others merge. In the Christianization of the world consists the plan of which history is the expression and execution.

This is the plan conceived ages ago, in the mind of omnipotence, which is the manifestation of the power, wisdom, justice, and especially of the infinite love of God. The history of the world is a majestic temple, at which man is at work under the direction and according to the plan of the Almighty.

This temple is continually drawing nearer its completion. May we, as co-laborers on this glorious edifice, recognize our calling, do our part readily and cheerfully, and thus hasten the time when the idea of humanity will be realized, when "the nations of the world will have become the Lord's and His Christ's," and ransomed humanity with the restored image of God will be the honor and glory of the Creator.

A. E. D.

## TROST DER RELIGION.

RELIGION ist die Anerkennung Gottes als des Gegenstandes der Liebe, des Gehorsams und der Verehrung. Religion ist daher ein nothwendiges Element in dem Character eines jeden Menschen. Ohne jene Anerkennung Gottes ist ein gehaltvolles würdiges menschliches Leben unmöglich. Die Religion ist das Band, wodurch der Mensch mit seinem Schöpfer verbunden und zu seines Schöpfers Thron emporgehoben wird. Wenn dieses Band irgend einmal zerbrochen wird, so irrt der Mensch zwecklos und ziellos in der Welt umher, ohne wahres Licht und wahren Trost im Leben, ohne Hoffnung, ohne feste Zuversicht im Tode, wer keinen Sinn für die Pflichten der Religion hat und den Versuch nicht cheut, ohne Gott zu lieben und zu sterben, der hat den Zweck seiner Schöpfung zu vereiteln angefangen, ein Streben das wenn es gelings, in geistiger Selbstverrichtung, im geistigem Tode enden muss.

Es giebt bekanntlich mehren Religionen, die man in wahre und falsche zu unterscheiden pflegt; aber es ist nicht unser Zweck die Geschichte oder das Wesen der verschiedenen Religionen zu besprechen; wir setzen vielmehr, eine allgemeine Bekanntschaft mit denselben voraus. Sollte man aber fragen, welches denn die wahre Religion sei, so antworten wir kurz: diejenige, die in über einstimmung mit dem Worte Gottes Jesum Christum als den alleinigen Grund der Seligkeit weisz. Seit Christus der Sohn Gottes menschgeworden und durch seinen freien Liebes-Tod unsere Versöhnung mit God vollbracht, ist die Christliche Religion die allein wahre und ewig gultige Religion. Es kann daher auch die Christliche Religion allein den rechten Trost und die ewige Seligkeit verleihen. Jede andere Religion dagegen kann nichte wahrhaft befriedigen, kann die Seele nicht mit Gott in Gemeinschaft bringen, kann also auch ihren Durst nach Gott nicht stillen, kann kein Liebesleben zwischen Gott und den Menschen stiften, kann nicht in den Stand der Kindschaft zu Gott, sondern nur in den der Knechtschaft zu Ihm den Menschen versetzen, weil ihr die Macht fehlt, die Schuld und das Schuldbewusstsein des Menschen durch Sühne zu tilgen.

Gott selbst ist der Urheber jeder wahren Religion, indem nur durch Göttliche Offenbarung, durch Liebesthaten Gottes an die

Menschheit ein wahren religiosers Wissen von Gott möglich ist. Einer solchen Gottlichen stiftung nun, erfreut sich auser der Christlichen nur noch die Judische Religion, die man als Vorbereitung auf das Christenthum wird ansehen müssen.

Der judischen Religion fehlte daher auch keineswegs die Kraft in ihren Bekennern ein wahres festes religioses Leben zu gründen. In allen Orten, in allen Verhältnissen, des Lebens in freud und Seid, in Gluck und Ungluck, unter Verfolgungen aller art hielt sich der fromme Jude mit bewunderungswürdiger Treue am Gesetze und an dem Gott seiner Vater. Aber trotz der Erzeugung solcher Lebenskraft ist die Judische religion doch noch nicht die höchste und letzte. Der Offenbarung des Gesetzes sollte vielmehr noch die Offenbarung der Liebe folgen.

Der Alte Bund mit seinen Priestern und Opfern und Cerimonien musste in der Fülle der Zeit dem neuen weihen, Christus, der Sohn Gottes, hat in selbstvergesender Liebe durch sein heiliges Leben, Leiden und Sterben diesen neuen Bund, als einen ewig gultigen gestiftet und mit seinem theuren Blute versiegelt. Dadurch nun ist dem Sunde ein neuer weg zu Gott gebahnt.

Statt unzähliger Gesetzeswerke die der Sünder nicht leisten konnte, verlangt nur das seine Werk: den Glauben an Jesum Christum, der das ganze Gesets erfüllt hat und mit Seiner Gerechtigkeit uns vor Gott vertritt. Die Gerechtigkeit, die Gott im alten Bunde von dem Sunde fordert, bietet er im Neuen Bunde demselben als Geschenk dar in Jesu Christo, dem Sohne der Liebe, und verlangt wird mer noch das Annehmen dieser Gabe durch den Glauben. Dadurch ist nun aber selbst dem ärmsten und blodesten Sunde der Weg zu Gott gebahnt und die Thore des Himmels geöffnet und darinn ist für eine Welt von Sunden, wie die unsrige, die Christlichen Religion die alleinige, wahre, unversiegbare Quelle des Friedens und des Trostes. Und dieser Trost besteht in der festen Zuversicht, dass wer im Glauben mit Christo, dem Sohne Gottes vereint, durch Ihm die freie Eergbung aller unserer Sunden, vollkommene Versohnung mit Gott und ewiges seliges Leben haben. Diese Zuversicht wirkt der Troster oder der Heilige Geist in den Herzen der Glaubigen durch die Predigt des Evangeliums von Christo, dem für uns gekreuzigten aber wieder erstandenen und zur rechten Gottes erhöhten Herrn der Herrlichkeit. Durch den wahren Glauben, den Er so wirkt, giebt der Heilige Geist Zeugniß unserem Geiste, dass wir Gottes



Kinder sind. Und das ist der Trost den wir bedürfen im Leben und im Sterben, dass nämlich, ob wir leben oder sterben, wir des Herrn sind und keine Macht uns trennen kann von der Liebe Gottes die in Christo Jesu ist unserem Herrn. In diesem von Gott gewirkten Troste liegt dann auch die Kraft zu einem neuen Gott wohlgefulligen menschlichen Leben. Durch den Glauben an Christum wird nicht nur ein neues Wissen von Gott, sondern auch ein neues Herz, ein neuer Sinn, eine thatkraftige mit mancherlei Gaben des Geistes ausgerustete Liebe erzeugt. Einen solchen über das Diesseits hinausgreifenden, über Tod und Grab siegreich sich erhebenden Trost nun kannt die auser christliche Menschheit nicht; für diesen Frieden, welcher höher ist als alle Vernunft, fehlt ihr die, Empfanglichkeit. Oft laugnet sie sogar die Unentbehrlichkeit eines solchen festen, sicheren, auf Gottes geoffenbarter Liebe in Christo gegründeten Trostes. Durch Haschen noch allerlei irdischen Dingen sucht man dann das Verlangen der Seele nach Gott zu befriedigen, oder das Gewissen zum Schweigen zu bringen, Ehre, Reichthum, Familienglück, Kunst und Wissenschaft, ja oft das Laster selbst, erscheinen einer so verfinsterten Seele als die hochsten Guter des Lebens, und in der Erlangung solcher Schätze wird dann der hochste und letzte Zweck des menschlichen Daseins gefunden. Aber dieser breite, für das Fleisch bequeme Weg führt doch zum Verderben trotz der auseren Pracht und Herrlichkeit derer, die ihn wandeln, Jene irdischen Guter sind eben keine Speise für den Geist; Kräfte für die Ewigkeit können sie an sich nicht geben und bitter muss die Enttauschung derer sein, die solches von ihnen erwarteten; schrecklich in der Stunde des Todes muss der Zustand des Menschen sein, der sich nur irdischen Schätze gesammelt, deren ganzliche Nichtigkeit er nun erkennt.

Anders steht es mit dem Christen. Ein Kind Gottes durch den Glauben an Christum, darf er Alles, auch die irdischen Guter, sein nennen, aber er halt diese Guter nicht für einen Raub, sondern betrachtet sie als Tugendmittel, die ihm Gott gegeben, und sein Grundsatz in Bezug auf sie ist: zu haben als hatte er nicht. Kein Gut der Erde bietet seine, in Gott freie Seele und kommt der Tod, so heisst er freudig ihn willkommen als Ewigang in das Leben.

DIE WAHRE BESTIMMUNG DES MENSCHEN.

NACHDEM der grosse Schöpfer die Werke des fünften Schöpfungstages vollendet hatte, war noch kein Geschöpf da, das die vielfachen Schönheiten und Gaben der Schöpfung mit Selbstbewusstsein hatte geniessen können. Das Haus war fertig die Dienerschaft bereit aber es war noch kein Herr da. Darum schuf Gott noch am sechsten Tage als Haupt und Krone seiner Werke, den Menschen, der mit hohen und edlen Gaben and Kräften ausgerüstet, geziert und geschmückt gleichsam das Meisterstück das höchste edelste Werk seiner Hande sein sollte. Der Mensch bildet somit die höchste Reihe die organischen Geschöpfe. Seinem Körper nach gehört er der Erde an, und hat eine gewisse Verwandtschaft mit den Thieren, weivohl, ihn schon in dieser Beziehung Manichs, namentlich, seine aufrechte Stellung und der Bau seiner Hande und Fusse, auszeichnet. Der Bau der Menschen ist wunderbar. Sein Körper übertrifft schon alle Thiere an Schönheit and Vollkommenheit aber seine rechte Bedeutung erhält der Mensch doch erst durch das was den andern Geschöpfen mangelt durch seine vernünftige Seele.

Zwar haben die Thiere auch eine Art von Seele; es zeicht sich bei ihnen Erinnerung, Sehnsucht, Freude, Furcht, Schmerz und eine gewisse Willenskraft aber solches doch nur als Naturtrieb oder Instinkt, es fehlt ihnen das Bewusstsein und eben damit die Fähigkeit, ihren Schöpfer zu erkennen. Das Thier blickt mit gesenktem Antlitz nur zur Erde, aus der es entsprungen ist aber der Mensch erhebt seinen Blick zum Himmel und schaut in das Endlose des göttlichen Alls hinein.

Das Thier ist mit der Natur alles Irdischen eins; der Mensch ist durch seinen Geist über die Natur des Irdischen hinausgehoben. Der ganze Leib des Menschen ist unendlich geringer als die Seele. Der Leib muss dem Geiste dienen; er ist nur da für den Geist, ist nur Mittel wo gegen der Geist Zweck ist. Vermittelst des Geistes, der eine Kraft des Allerschönen und Menschen ist, ist die Seele bestimmt den Leib zu bewegen und zu regieren.

Das Innere Unsichtbare oder der Geist, ist daher dasjenige, welches wir eigentlich den Menschen heissen, weil wir die Hülle desselben den Körper, sobald das Belebende Unsichtbare ihn verlassen, dem Staube woraus er entnommen, wieder geben. In

der geistigen Natur des Menschen liegen auch die hohen Fähigkeiten, deren gemeinsame Entwicklung das menschliche Leben bezweckt. Indessen unterscheidet die Seele des Menschen sich von der Thier Seele, im Grunde nur dadurch, dass sie eine vernünftige ist. Wir finden im Menschen überhaupt drei Urkräfte, nämlich, Gefühls, Erkenntniss und Willenskraft oder mit andern Worten, Glauben, Erkennen und Wollen. Die Vernunft ward dem Menschen gegeben, um sich selbst und die ungebeugte Schöpfung zu erkennen. Die Gefühlskraft ward ihm gegeben zur Aufbewahrung jener heiligen Wahrheiten, die für die Vernunft zu geistig sind, und welche in Verbindung mit einem reinen Herzen die Grundlage der Religion ausmachen. Die Willenskraft wurde dem Menschen ertheilt, damit er zwischen den Wegen, welche Vernunft und Gefühlskraft ihm zeigen, frei wählen und den Trieben seiner thierischen oder aber geistigen Natur folgen könne.

Der Mensch vernimmt auch Gott in seinem Gewissen. Das Gewissen, welches nichts Anderes als die Stimme Gottes ist, als Richter und Regent über alle Kräfte und Neigungen des Menschen gesetzt und kann nur allein dadurch befriedigt werden, dass der Mensch sich Selbst und sein ganzes Leben Gott und seinen Dienste weihet. Denn betrachten wir den Menschen nicht in seinem Verhältniss oder im Lichte des Wortes Gottes, so finden wir seine Schöpfung ein grosses Geheimniss. In Selbsterhebung, Stolz und Eigendunkel des Bewusstseins seiner Abhängigkeit von Gott, sich entslagend, wird der Mensch ein Rathsel, das Leben eine Aufgabe unfähig einer Lösung, die Welt ein Chaos von verirrt und streitenden Elementen und Alles Forschen ein hoffnungsloses Wesen.

Der Mensch wird zum Atom einer Atomen Welt, von einem jeden Winde hin und her geschleudert, von einer jeden Welle herumgewirbelt, von einem jeden Strom fortgetragen, bis er in das Nichts woraus er unerklärbar hervorging verschwindet. In einem jeden Zeitalter hat es Menschen gegeben, die sich ganz der Sinnenlust ergaben und dadurch die Stimme ihres Schöpfers erstickten, die ihre Glückseligkeit in dem vergänglichlichen suchend bereit waren sich den unvernünftigen Thieren zuzugesellen, wie das Vieh zu leben, und zu sterben, zu walzen in der Lust und als Sinnspruch ihres Lebens zu nehmen, "Lasset uns fressen und saufen, denn Morgen sind wir tod."

Er ist erstaunlich, wie viele Menschen sich bemühen ihr Glück



in Irdischen zu finden. Sie leben ihrer Bestimmung zuwieder, wie das Vieh, denn sie mienen es gebe keine edlere Freude, kein besseres Leben und Wesen als in dieser Welt, die doch den wahren Christen nur ein Jammerthal ist, ja eine finstere Grube und ein tiefer Kerker. Viele Menschen laufen und rennen um das Glück zu erhaschen, aber sie wissen nicht worin ihr eigentliches Glück bestehe. Sie glauben sie seien glücklich indem sie nur arbeiten für das Fleisch das verweset, für das Gold und Silber welches verrostet, für Häuser und Aecker die sie bald nicht mehr kennen. So verblendet ist die unselige Menge, dass sie lieber das höchste Glück vergendet um elende Scheingüter und sinnlichen Genuss zu erlangen. Solche Menschen werden doch immer, aber grossentheils zu spät ihres thorichten Irrthums gewahr, denn wenn ihnen der thorichte Tausch gelungen ist, und sie durch Aufopferung ihres reinen Bewusstseins, Reichthumer und vergänglichlichen Tand sammengeschaart haben, so kann sich doch ihr Geist nicht daran vergnügen, und ein beständiges Sehnen nach Etwas, Besserem, Höherm, Bleibenderm, lehrt sie dass des Menschen wahres Glück nicht im Vergänglichlichen zu finden sei.

Deswegen kommen Alle diejenigen die ihre Hoffnung auf das Irdische setzen, und ihr Paradies in dieser Welt suchen nicht über den Viehischen Verstand hinaus, leben dahin wie ein Vieh, sind blind am innern Menschen, haben keine himmlischen Gedanken, können sich ihres Schöpfers freuen, sondern haben ihre Freude nur am Kothe dieser Welt.

Aber das ist nicht die Bestimmung des Menschen. Der Mensch ist unsterblich, aber alles Irdische vergehet und verschwindet. Der Mensch ist darum auch nicht bloss für diese Erde erschaffen. Das Interesse des Menschen ist nicht in dem Innern der Erde begraben. Der Mensch ist nicht nur erschaffen um seine Kräfte in der Erlangung eines Bissen Brodes, zu verschwenden. In fressen, saufen und lustig sein besteht nicht das wahre Leben eines Menschen. Jenes ist der Grundsatz einer Philosophie, die Gott nicht kennt und von Menschen die als Gottesleugner in der Welt leben, ohne Gott und ohne Hoffnung, "deren Gott ihr Bauch ist, die sich ihrer Schande rühmen." Alle Irdischen Dinge können dem unansloschlichem Verlangen des menschlichen Herzens, nach dem Ewigen und Gottlichen keine Erquickung bringen. Sie befriedigen des gewissen nicht. Der Mensch schaut über alle diese hinaus, hungrig, durstig, und gierig nach einer Freude die höher,

erquickender und dauernder ist, als alle Guter, der Welt ihm geben können.

Daher auch nur wenn wir im Lichte des Wortes Gottes das Leben als eine Vorbereitung, eine Arbeit, ein Kampf und eine Erlösung betrachten und diese Welt anschauen als die Werkstatt und das Arbeitsfeld des Geistes, um Ruhm, Ehre und ewiges Leben vor allem aber die Gotteskindschaft zu erlangen, wird Sonnenlicht über die dunkle Finsterniss des menschlichen Daseins ausgegossen, jeder Kummer gestillt, Muhe und Trubsal werden in engels Gewande geleidet, verwandelt greichsam in die neue Lebensgeister, emporgesandt den Erben der Unsterlichkeit zu dienen.

H. J. W.

COLLEGE ITEMS.—The item of most absorbing interest is, naturally enough, the rapidly approaching *Commencement*, with which, by what sounds to most persons a contradiction in terms, the Academic work of the year will *close*. For our five worthy *seniors* the occasion is prospectively invested with earnest significance. They are now *enjoying* their senior vacation, devoting its spare hours to the preparation of their graduating orations. Judging from their character and standing as students, we have no doubt that they will acquit themselves with credit.

As intimated, the class numbers five members a very good number for the first company of graduates. Four of the five have the ministry in view.

The *Commencement* will take place on Thursday, June 26, opening at 10:30 A. M. The exercises will consist of the graduating addresses by members of the Theological Class, the Baccalaureate address, and the usual opening and closing devotional services.

On Wednesday evening the Rev. A. Wanner, of York, Pa., will deliver the annual address before the Societies.

Many friends from a distance expect to be here. All will be welcome, and everything possible be done to provide for their pleasant entertainment. Only let them come in crowds. They will cheer the College by their presence, and will hardly fail to be gratified themselves.

All who can, should try to get here on Wednesday afternoon. Those coming from the *West* by taking the 2 P. M. *Reading* and *Philadelphia* train at *Harrisburg*, or the train which leaves *Reading* at 4:05 P. M., can reach us about 7 P. M. Those coming from Philadelphia can take the 1:30 P. M. train from Ninth and Green, and get here at 3; or the 5:15 P. M. train from Thirteenth and Callowhill, and get here by 7.

Those who cannot come on Wednesday, may take the 5 A. M. train at Har-

risburg, or the 7:30 A. M. train at Ninth and Green, Philadelphia, and get here by 9:30 A. M.

Let all be careful to get tickets for *Collegeville Station*, and to secure the right cars at the Perkiomen Junction. We have hopes of making arrangements for *excursion tickets* by the favor of the obliging Reading Railroad Company.

It would aid us in making needful arrangements for visiting friends, to have them *inform us by letter* of their intention to be here.

*A Class-tree.*—The *Seniors*, prompted by commendable desires to have their remembrance perpetuated, have planted a Siberian Arbor Vitæ in the College Campus. Long live their memorial tree. But even should it bend before some storm, or be blighted by some arctic winter, the affectionate remembrance of our First Seniors will flourish, as we trust theirs of the *Alma Mater*, and happy associations here, will never decay or fade. The tree was presented to the class by *Mr. Joseph K. Miller*, of Chester county, to whose kindness the members thankfully acknowledge their obligations.

The *New Catalogue* (for 1872-3) will be ready for distribution in a few days. Applications for a copy will be cheerfully favored.

*Acknowledgments.*—The following additional sums have been received in aid of our Educational Fund—for which the esteemed donors will please accept sincere thanks:

Rev. Dr. Kremer, Lebanon.....	\$50 00
Newburgh Reformed Church, Cumberland county.....	15 00
Race street (Philadelphia) Reformed Church, addition.....	29 00
Heidelberg do do do .....	30 00
Milton Reformed Church.....	25 00
Rev. J. Sechler, Hanover.....	35 00
Rev. F. Lindaman (Blain Charge).....	15 00

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*Other claims* crowd the Editor's desk for June into a very narrow corner. Our readers must not be disappointed, or at least not complain.

*When the May number* reached us, we exceedingly regretted to find that the book notices, and several church news items, had necessarily been laid over. The book notices will be found in the present issue. They should always be read, and a note should be made of such books as may seem specially desirable.

*Synodical Representation.* The *Messenger* (Dr. F.), which we are not at all afraid to mention by name, &c., are still tinkering at what the party they represent regard as unequal and unfair representation. They want, of course, to



secure more votes for the next General Synod. One of them (H. in the *Messenger*) almost said so.

Now we insist upon it, as we said before, the most unfair sort of delegate representation is *misrepresentation*. And it is by this sort that the party in question has made any progress at all. The real sentiments, faith, and wishes of the people are not in many, very many, cases represented at all. Thus Dr. Fisher *misrepresented* his constituency at Martinsburg, last October. And the same thing is being constantly done. We, too, want the full, fair, honest and intelligent voice of the church. By all means let some plan be devised for securing that. But we may rest assured, that the plan will not be devised just now by the *Messenger & Co.* Why, one of the grossest wrongs inflicted almost weekly upon the church, is the denial, evasion, or affected contempt, of point black proofs adduced of the anti-Reformed character of the errors of the school which the *Messenger* strives to cover with its short-feathered anserine wings.

That paper is afraid, yes afraid, to tell the church squarely and honestly what the leaders of the new-order party hold, teach, and aim at accomplishing. And if once in awhile a little of it leaks out, there will be found in the same paper a selection of absurdly contradictory articles, which may divert attention from offensive things, or keep them from being seen.

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

*From the Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia :*

*Across the Desert.* A life of Moses. By the Rev. S. M. Campbell, D.D. With maps and illustrations.

This is a very valuable contribution to Sunday-school literature of the more Scriptural and instructive sort. It supplies just what every student of the early history of the Israelites and of their journey to Canaan needs. Simple in style, and appropriate in illustration, no one can use it without great profit. Not only Sunday-school teachers, but Christian parents would find it of great service in family instruction. In many respects it would serve the purpose of a Commentary. The author having himself visited Egypt and Palestine, was the better fitted to issue such a work.

*From Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, New York :*

*Siam, the Land of the White Elephant, as it was, and as it is.* Compiled and arranged by George B. Bacon.

Instead of attempting to state the merits of this exceedingly attractive volume, which is one of the series of the Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration and Adventure, it will probably be more satisfactory to our readers to learn what the enterprising publishers have to say in regard to this library, in the following advertisement :

*The Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration and Adventure.* Edited by Bayard Taylor. The extraordinary popularity of the Illustrated Library of Wonders (nearly one and a half million copies having been sold in this country

and in France), is considered by the publishers a sufficient guarantee of the success of an *Illustrated Library of Travel, Exploration and Adventure*, embracing the same decidedly interesting and permanently valuable features. Upon this new enterprise the publishers will bring to bear all their wide and constantly increasing resources. Neither pains nor expense will be spared in making their new library not only one of the most elegant and profusely illustrated works of the day, but at the same time one of the most graphic and fascinating in narrative and description.

Each volume will be complete in itself, and will contain, first, a brief preliminary sketch of the country to which it is devoted; next, such an outline of previous explorations as may be necessary to explain what has been achieved by later ones; and finally, a condensation of one or more of the most important narratives of recent travel, accompanied with illustrations of the scenery, architecture, and life of the races, drawn only from the most authentic sources. An occasional volume will also be introduced in the Library, detailing the exploits of individual adventurers. The entire series will thus furnish a clear, picturesque, and practical survey of our present knowledge of lands and races as supplied by the accounts of travelers and explorers. The Library will therefore be both entertaining and instructive to young as well as old, and the publishers intend to make it a necessity in every family of culture, and in every private and public library in America. The name of BAYARD TAYLOR, as editor, is an assurance of the accuracy and high literary character of the publication. Price, \$1.50 a volume.

QUARTERLIES FOR APRIL.—*The Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review*. Edited by Lyman H. Atwater and Henry B. Smith.

Ten ably written articles, each on a subject of great interest in theology or Christian literature, will not fail to make this number of the Review welcome to its patrons. The list comprises: I. The three ideas (the True, the Beautiful and the Good), by Prof. H. N. Day, of New Haven. II. Crimes of passion and reflection, by J. R. Bittinger, Pa. III. The immediate cause of the death of Christ, by Wm. M. K. Imbrie, of Jersey City. IV. Dr. Dorner's system of theology (in outline), translated by Prof. G. S. Hall. V. The Persian cuneiform inscription, the key to the Assyrian, by Prof. Wm. Henry Green. VI. An obituary of Dr. Liebner, by Dr. Dorner, translated by Prof. W. A. Packard. VII. Remnants of the twelve tribes, by John H. Shedd. VIII. Tullock's rational theology, by Prof. J. H. Gillett, New York. IX. Hamilton's Autology. X. Notice of Dr. Burns, by Dr. McCosh. To these are added: XI. Notes on Current Topics. XII. Contemporary Literature. XIII. Theological and literary intelligence. The *Review* is published by John M. Sherwood, 38 John street, New York. Price, \$3.50 a year.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA and *Theological Eclectic*. Edited by Edwards A. Park, Andover, and George E. Day, New Haven. Published by W. F. Draper, Andover. Price, \$4.00 a year.

The April number of this theologically popular Quarterly, may take some of its readers aback by an opening article on *St. Elizabeth*, of Hungary, from the

pen of Prof. Lacroix, of Delaware, Ohio. Article II. is a translation, (by C. R. Gregory, of Princeton), of *Luthardt*, on the design of St. John's Gospel. III. Miracles, by Prof. Porter, of Belfast, Ireland. IV. St. Patrick's Purgatory and Dante's Inferno, by Fr. Vinton, Librarian of Congress, Washington. V. The Progress of Christ's Kingdom in its relation to the Spirit of the Present Age, by Dr. Harris, of Yale College. VI. Revelation and Inspiration, by Dr. Barrows, of Chicago. VII. The Chronological value of the Genealogy in Genesis, by Dr. F. Gardiner, of Middletown, Connecticut. VIII. J. McLeod Campbell's Theory of the Atonement, by Edward A. Park. IX. Culman's Ethics. X. Strauss's Superficiality. XI. Dr. Hodge and the New England Theology, by Dr. Pond, of Bangor, Maine. XII. Recent Works on Prehistoric Archæology. XIII. Whichcote's Aphorisms. XIV. Notices of Recent Publications.

*The Christian Weekly*, finely illustrated, published by the American Tract Society, has already reached a circulation of 32,000. Arrangements have been made hereafter to combine with it the periodical of the Young Men's Christian Association. The *Weekly* cannot be too warmly commended.

*The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, January, 1873.

Published quarterly in St. Louis, and "intended as a vehicle for such translations, commentaries, and original articles as will best promote the interests of speculative philosophy in all its departments." The contents of the January number will serve to indicate at once the character and value of the *Journal*. It offers the following articles: I. Prof. Fraser's Berkley, by J. H. Stirling. II. Hegel's Psychology, by K. Rosenkrans. III. Trendelenberg as opponent of Hegel, by A. Vera. IV. Æsthetics of Chivalry. Fidelity, by G. W. F. Hegel. V. Facts of Consciousness, by J. G. Fichte. VI. Foundation of Authority in the State. VII. Philosophemes. VIII. Pedagogics as a System. IX. Hamlet. X. Book Notices. Terms, \$2.00 a year, or 50 cents a single number. Address: W. T. Harris, Box 2398, St. Louis, Mo.

*The Annual Catalogue* of Franklin and Marshall College, and of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., for 1872—3, has been received. The list of students for the year, shows 79 in the College, and 51 in the Preparatory school; a total of 130 in both departments, or 18 less than the whole number in Ursinus College for the previous academic year. There were 27 students connected with the several classes in the Theological Seminary.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH—*Ministerial Changes*.—Rev. J. S. Gough's post-office address is German, Ohio.

Rev. P. J. Spangler's post-office address is Plymouth, Marshall county, Ind.

Rev. C. Baum's post-office address is Ft. Wayne, Ind.



Rev. W. Kuntzel's address is Lowell, Dodge county, Wisconsin.

Rev. Abner R. Kremer's address is Emmitsburg, Md.

Rev. J. F. Snyder's address is Manor Dale, Westmoreland county, Pa.

ADDITIONS TO THE CHURCHES.—Hartville, Ohio, Rev. J. M. Grether, pastor, twenty-six were added; and six were added to the Randolph charge.

Mt. Zion, Ohio, Rev. D. Winters, pastor, eleven persons were added.

Tuscarawas charge, Rev. H. F. Long, pastor, two were added. In the Cross Roads Church seven were added.

Wadsworth, Ohio, Rev. S. B. Leiter, pastor, thirty-six were added.

Louisville, Rev. J. H. Klein, pastor, eighteen were added.

Bethlehem, Pa., Rev. I. K. Loos, pastor, thirty-five were added.

South Bethlehem, Pa., twelve were added.

Brodheadsville, Pa., Rev. D. E. Schoedler, pastor, thirty-two persons were added.

Kriedersville, Pa., Rev. C. A. Rittenhouse, pastor, forty-three were added.

Huntingdon, Pa., Rev. H. G. Dole, pastor, thirty-nine were added.

Anna, Ill., Rev. J. A. Smith, pastor, eight were added.

Allentown, Pa., Rev. S. G. Wagner, pastor, fifteen were added.

Catawissa, Pa., Rev. Y. D. Dechart, pastor, ten were added; and twenty-six to the church at Media.

Williamsport, Pa., Rev. A. J. Heller, pastor, six were added.

West Philadelphia, Rev. J. G. Noss, pastor, six were added.

Friedensburg, Berks county, Pa., Rev. P. P. A. Hoffman, pastor, thirty-two were added.

Tiffin, Ohio, Rev. Dr. H. Rust, pastor, twenty-five were added.

Troutville, Pa., Rev. C. F. Hoffmeier, pastor, sixteen were added.

Bellevue, Ohio, Rev. J. H. Derr, pastor, twenty were added.

Carlisle, Pa., Rev. J. S. Foulk, pastor, four were added.

Brownbach's Charge, Pa., Rev. Wm. Sorber, pastor, thirty-six were added.

Allentown, Pa., Rev. N. S. Strassberger, pastor, sixty-eight were added.

Irvin, Pa., Rev. John M. Titzel, pastor, six were added.

Paradise Charge, Pa., H. Mosser, pastor, twenty were added.

Mahanoy City, Pa., Rev. H. A. Keyser, pastor, thirty-four were added.

Stonington, Ill., Rev. H. H. Sandoe, pastor, three were added.

Covington, Ky., Rev. G. Hanhart, pastor, seven were added.

Cherry Mission, Pa., Rev. J. H. Schlappig, pastor, seven were added.

Mt. Pleasant, Rev. D. B. Lady, pastor, nineteen were added.

Jefferson, Md., Rev. S. S. Miller, pastor, twenty-three were added.

Mechanicsburg, Pa., Rev. J. Ault, pastor, nine were added.

Pottstown, Pa., Rev. L. D. Leberman, pastor, twenty-nine were added.

Baltimore, Md., Rev. J. C. Hauser, pastor, twenty-five were added.

Shamokin, Pa., Rev. D. W. Kelley, pastor, twenty-three were added.

Thornville, Ohio, Rev. C. W. Hoyman, nine were added.

First Church, Philadelphia, fourteen were added.

Hamburg, Pa., Rev. W. F. P. Davis, pastor, twenty-one were added.

Gettysburg, Pa., Rev. W. R. H. Deatrich, pastor, forty-seven were added.

Sunbury, Pa., Rev. C. S. Gerhard, pastor, twenty-five were added.

Egypt, Rev. S. A. Leinbach, pastor, sixty-nine were added.

Pittsburg, Pa., Rev. T. J. Barkley, pastor, eighteen were added.

Allegheny City, Rev. J. A. Hoffheins, pastor, ten were added.

Mohecanville, Ohio, Rev. O. E. Lake, pastor, recently enjoyed a special season of grace, as reported by the esteemed pastor. About 54 persons professed faith in Christ; 46 were added to the congregation, 35 by confirmation, 6 on renewed profession, and 5 by certificate. Of this number 31 were heads of families. Assuredly, brother Lake has reason to thank God and take courage.

CHURCH DEDICATIONS.—The German Evangelical Reformed Emanuel's church, Thirty-eighth and Baring streets, West Philadelphia, was dedicated on May 18th. Rev. J. Knelling, of Cincinnati, Ohio, preached in German; Rev. B. Bausman, D.D., preached in English. Rev. M. Bachman, of Baltimore, Md., and Rev. T. S. Johnston, D.D., of Lebanon, also took part in the services.

Re-dedication of the Reformed church at Annville, took place on Easter Monday, Rev. E. V. Gerhard, Rev. Charles H. Leinbach, Rev. J. P. Stein, and Rev. G. W. Aughinbaugh were present and took part in the services. Much interest was manifested in all the services.

OBITUARY.—During the past month two more beloved co-workers and faithful servants of the Lord in the ministry of the Gospel, have been permitted, triumphantly, to finish their earthly course and reach their heavenly rest.

The Rev. *Conrad Saure* died in Cincinnati, on May 21. For several years he had suffered much from an internal chronic disease, but with the courage of faith struggled against it, and persevered in his arduous labors. Last summer a respite from active duty was cheerfully granted him by his devoted people, and means were kindly furnished for a visit to his native land, in the hope that alleviation, if not an entire cure, might be obtained from one of the more celebrated mineral springs of Germany, in connection with the hoped-for effects of rest and travel. The desired result was, however, but very partially secured. Although after his return, he resumed his labors, his sufferings continued. When we last had the privilege of meeting him during the sessions of the General Synod at Cincinnati, his bodily condition painfully impressed us as most precarious. The disease was evidently gaining upon his system, until at last the Lord brought the permanent relief of death unto immortal victory.

Our departed brother was a native of Darmstadt, in Hesse, Germany, where he was born October 31, 1820, and enjoyed the blessings of a truly Christian nurture under the care of pious parents, and of the means of grace in an Evangelical church. This led to an early personal consecration of himself to the service of his covenant God and Saviour, in full communion with the people of the Lord. In 1845 he emigrated to America, and was led by Providence to St. Louis, where a congenial field of labor awaited him, in the colportage work of the American Tract Society. By the devoted zeal with which he prosecuted his work, the spirit of his piety clearly proved itself. His success was marked, and in 1848

he was transferred to what was thought a more important field, in the same work, in Cincinnati.

The sphere and character of his labors, naturally deepened his conviction of the great existing need of more ministerial work in Cincinnati, and afforded him opportunity of furnishing himself intellectually for the work. He resolved to devote his life to it, and was kindly and efficiently aided in his special studies by Prof. Rust, then pastor of our church in Cincinnati. He began to preach stately in 1856, selecting one of the more neglected localities of the city. In 1858 he was ordained, took full charge of the mission he had begun, and a large congregation in a few years was gathered around him, to which he devoted his life. The congregation now numbers nearly 700 communicants. An earnest Gospel preacher, unswervingly steadfast in the old apostolic faith of his church, a faithful sympathising pastor, no man could have been more beloved by his people in his life, or be more deeply lamented in his death.

The Rev. *Peter S. Fisher*, for fifteen years pastor of the Sellersville (Bucks county, Pa.,) charge, during the afternoon of May 22, Ascension-day. The event, so sad for surviving friends, occurred away from his home. He had gone, on an exchange of pulpits, to preach in one of Bro. Yearick's churches, and was taken suddenly ill in the pulpit, from which he was carried to a neighboring house, where in a short time he expired. The disease, we were informed, was ossification of the heart. Although in apparent health, or with but a slight sense of ailment, he seems to have had strong premonitions that his end was near, and gave expression to them on several occasions previously. The Lord who was coming, warned his faithful servant of His purpose, and supplied such grace for the solemn hour, that when it arrived he could meet it joyfully, and with his dying breath exclaim: The Lord's name be praised; blessed be the name of the Lord.

He was born in Berks county, Pa., in 1804; was constrained by inward convictions early to dedicate his life to the ministry, which after a course of preparatory studies, he entered in his 21st year. His first field of labor was in Dauphin county, Pa. Hence, after a few years, he removed to Centre county, Pa., where he labored twenty-five years. It was during this period we first had the privilege of becoming acquainted with him, whilst he was in attendance at the Synod of Lancaster, in 1838, when license to preach the Gospel was granted to us. At his earnest solicitation we were first led to our field of labor, in Mifflin county. The acquaintance formed at Lancaster, ripened into closer friendship at the dedication of the Loope church; to which he had invited us, and his friendship was still more fully strengthened by his having been, subsequently, (at Christmas, 1838,) one of the committee by whom we were ordained. The bond thus formed, never relaxed.

Brother Fisher's kind, natural spirit, sanctified by grace, endeared him to all who knew him, and won the warmest affection of his people in the several charges he served.

It was our sad privilege to attend his funeral, on May 28th, at Sellersville.



A vast concourse of members and friends, including fifty ministers, of our own and other denominations, joined his afflicted family in following his remains to the grave. The sad occasion was improved by highly appropriate discourses in German, at the house by the Rev. J. Wiehle of Philadelphia, and in the church by the Rev. Dr. Bausman of Reading, followed by a discourse in English, by Rev. Dr. Gerhart of Lancaster.

Brother Fisher not only enjoyed universal esteem for his personal worth, but was a most laborious and successful minister. It was stated at the funeral that he had preached more than 8,000 sermons, and had been instrumental in adding thousands to the church.

Thus two more watchmen have been summoned from the watchtower, when the city of the Lord might seem most to need their faithful vigilance. Two more laborers have been called away from the field, at a time when more are needed. But the Lord of the vineyard, the keeper of the city, liveth. Blessed are the dead who have died in Him! And blessed be the Lord who can, and will, raise up others in their stead. They labored long and earnestly. Let none envy them their *rest*, even though we deplore our loss.

HOME MISSIONS.—Our brethren of both Synods in the west are engaging with fresh energy in the good work. The threat of Dr. T. G. Apple, speaking apparently for his party in the east, that hereafter that party will take care not to help those who will not serve its schemes, is calculated to stimulate western as well as eastern zeal. *The Board of the Synod of Ohio* has issued a stirring circular, appealing for more active cōoperation and more liberal aid. The circular cannot fail to have a good effect.

At the same time, the Board of the *Synod of the Northwest*, (German), is appealing to the churches for greatly needed aid in carrying on their special work in the ever-widening German field. In their appeal they state, that never have so many doors been open, or such important fields been inviting effort. These facts give special force to the appeal, and should elicit a liberal response. We earnestly bespeak for it prompt attention. And, as an additional encouragement for our friends to aid this cause, they may feel assured that their contributions to it will go to the maintenance and advancement of a *truly Evangelical Reformed Christianity*.

Moneys intended for German Missions of the Synod of the Northwest, should be forwarded in postal orders or checks on banks, to *Rev. D. Zimmerman*, Galion, Ohio.

Monies intended for the Board of Missions of the Synod of Ohio, should be sent to *Rev. William H. Fenneman*, Tiffin, Seneca county, Ohio.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.—By the action of the General Synod at Cincinnati, the cause of Foreign Missions has been revived in our church. It was greatly to our reproach that interest in it was allowed to decline, and that our connection with it was ever suspended. Of the cause or causes of this, it would now be of no advantage to speak. One fact, however, is significant and should be marked as an admonition. From almost the very date of the Synod's withdrawal from

the cause of missions to the gentile or heathen world, that of Home Missions waned. "He that would save his life shall lose it."

In accordance with the action of the late General Synod, a meeting of the members of the new Board was held in Harrisburg on Tuesday, April 15th. On calling the roll, one of the first things which arrested attention, was the fact that one of the members, the lamented Dr. Zacharias, had been called from the earthly vineyard to the heavenly Paradise. Suitable action was taken in regard to the solemn event, and subsequently the Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., of Lebanon, was chosen to fill the vacancy. The Board was formally organized by the election of Rev. T. S. Johnston, D.D., of Lebanon, as President; J. H. A. Bomberger, Vice President; Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., Secretary; and R. F. Kelker, esq., of Harrisburg, as Treasurer. The Executive Committee consists of the officers, and W. H. Seibert, of Harrisburg. The Rev. J. M. Ferris, Corresponding Secretary of the Reformed church of America (Dutch), being present, made, by request, some remarks on points of special interest and importance to the Board at the resumption of the work. Our veteran brother, the Rev. B. Schneider, D.D., of the Broosa Mission, who was at the time on a brief visit to Harrisburg, favored the Board with some valuable suggestions. It was likewise gratifying to have present during a part of the sessions, the Rev. B. S. Schneck, D.D., and Rev. W. H. H. Snyder. Although the action of the Board at this first meeting was necessarily of a mere preliminary character, the following item will convince the church that the Board means work, and earnest, immediate work.

On motion of Rev. W. K. Zieber, seconded by Elder William D. Gross, of Philadelphia, it was resolved to select some district or city of *Japan* as our mission field, and that the Executive Committee be instructed to procure the needful specific information in regard to the particular point to be chosen for commencing operations, and also to secure suitable missionaries for the field.

An interesting and suggestive letter was received from the Rev. D. Willers, D.D., who regretted his inability to attend the meeting.

Thus the good work was fairly begun in the spirit of prayerful reliance upon the favor of the Lord; and by His blessing it may be confidently hoped that the seemingly small beginning will lead to large results for His cause, and the salvation of many now sitting in darkness and the shadow of death.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—*Ritualism a failure.* In *Editor's Desk* for May, will be found an item on this topic. When writing it, search was made for the following extract (which had been laid aside for use), but we could not then find it. Having since discovered it, it is given as a confirmation of what is said in the *Desk*. The item is clipped from an *exchange* which Dr. Fisher also receives. Why did he not see and copy it into the *Messenger* for the benefit of his readers and regard for the truth? Was it not to his mind and purpose?

A writer in the *Examiner and Chronicle* gives his views concerning semi-liturgical services, as follows:

"The Congregational Conference, composed of the churches in New York,

Brooklyn, and the neighborhood, meets next week in Dr. Scudder's church. The questions for discussion are the practical ones for the hour. They embrace the public reading of the Word of God, and the value of expository preaching, with the introduction of a sort of liturgical service, with the alternate reading of the Scriptures by the pastor and people. Nearly every minister who is not in the Episcopal church, has had the fit on him once in his life, when he wished that he could introduce into his congregation a portion of liturgical service. But when the yoke has been once fairly put upon him, and he is bound to the same utterances year out and year in—when he sees the restlessness of men under the yoke, who sigh for the freedom of unfettered speech, he is content to let well enough alone. A liturgy, or the alternate reading of the Scriptures, has never been a success outside of the Episcopal church. The Methodists have a Liturgy, but they do not use it except at communion service, and then very sparingly. The Dutch church have a Liturgy, which is unused. The Moravians have broken away from the Episcopacy, and their service now is nearly congregational. Mr. Towne, of Boston, then a very popular preacher, introduced liturgical service into his church. It was too much for congregationalism, and the society dwindled and died. Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, had a complete Book of Service compiled. If it was ever used at all, it was long ago abandoned. Some wealthy Presbyterians in Rochester built a church and fitted it up with all appliances of liturgical service, gown, bands and all. The congregation was feeble at the start, and it is feeble to-day. The Unitarians have made several attempts to breathe life into their system by forms of prayer. They have got more prayer-books in their body than hymn-books. The aristocratic church in Boston, known as King's Chapel, has always had a Liturgy. It could not hold its property without it. Though rich, the congregation has always been exceedingly feeble. Dr. Osgood was the author of the Vesper Service, a sort of diluted compilation from the Evening Service of the prayer-book. But it never was a success, and served only as a bridge to take its author into the Episcopal church. Men who want responsive worship, know where to find it, with the charm of music and paraphernalia that never have been, and probably never will be, grafted on to the simple services of non-Episcopal churches."—*Presbyterian*.

THE English newspapers mention with admiration points, the fact that Mr. Williamson, of St. Peter's, lately preached before the Queen from the text, "Be sure your sin will find you out." Another sensation was produced by Prebendary Russell, in a sermon before the royal family on stewardship, in which, after dwelling on the admirable manner in which the Prince Consort discharged his stewardship, he referred to the nation's hope, that the Prince of Wales, who was present, would discharge his duties in like manner.



**WM. PAINTER & CO.,**  
**BANKERS,**  
**No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,**  
**PHILADELPHIA.**

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF  
**GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.**

---

**Gold, Stocks and Bonds**

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE  
*PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.*

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.

---

**MORNING SUNBEAMS**

For the playroom, Schoolroom, and Nursery. Selected by Mrs. E. Prentiss for the little folks, to hang on their chamber and schoolroom walls, like the "Silent Comforter" in hospitals, and furnish a divine talisman for every day. Folio. 32 pp. 75c.; post. 10c.

**PRAYER.**

A new and attractive devotional manual, containing suggestions and hints from our best writers, on the Lord's Prayer, and prayer in general. 104 pp. large 32mo. 20c.; post 4c.

**THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT.**

Lessons from Christ's conflict and victory. By Rev. A. F. Dickson. The teacher of youth, the tempted and the troubled Christian, will find it valuable. 144 pp. 18mo. 40c.; post 8c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISSELL,

1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

SPRING TERM, 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The WINTER TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, will open on Monday APRIL, 7, 1873, and continue sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

WILLIAM H. SNYDER, Instructor in the Academic Department.

J. G. NEFF, Tutor.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.—JULY, 1873.—No. 7.

---

THE UNION MOVEMENT.

AMONG the most interesting and significant "signs of the times," the great and far-reaching movements in favor of a closer, organized union of the several branches of the *Reformed church*, are entitled to serious and favorable consideration. The subject received the earnest attention of the two leading *Presbyterian Assemblies* (North and South), this spring, just as it had engaged our General Synod last autumn. And at the recent meeting of the General Synod of the Reformed (Dutch) church in America, an entire day or more was given to the matter, and highly interesting addresses were delivered by our own delegate (Dr. Welker), and by delegates from other bodies. Believing that these addresses will be read with pleasure, and that they contain excellent arguments and appeals in favor of Union, we copy them from the *Christian Intelligencer* of June 19th. Let them be prayerfully pondered:

*Dr. Welker's Address.*

Dr. Welker said that his commission to the Reformed church of America was the highest honor he had ever received. His earliest associations were connected with this church, and both churches had a common origin. His own church had five District Synods, thirty-five Classes, five hundred and eighty-six ministers, one thousand three hundred and twelve congregations, and one hundred and thirty thousand three hundred members, stretched over twenty-four States. There has been a large increase the



past year, which was being swelled greatly by the German immigration to this country. Hitherto they have had no Foreign Missions, but the last Synod resolved to establish one near one of the missions of the Reformed church, and to labor hand in hand with its missionaries.

But my mission is of a special character. Two years ago our delegate pressed the subject of a closer union. The matter was brought up by overture from the Classes. We think that such a union is both natural and desirable. Dr. Peltz inquired formally concerning our opinions on this important matter. It is in harmony with the feelings of our people in general. It is the express and sincere desire of our church to be brought into the closest relations with you which Providence may indicate. Our Synod expressed this feeling in the following resolution :

*Resolved*, That this General Synod (German church) is in full accord with the prevailing sentiment in the church, and looks forward with pleasure to the union with the Reformed church, upon terms which may be honorable to both, etc.

Hence, the German Reformed church appointed a committee of three to confer with a like committee of the Reformed church upon the subject of Union. I cannot anticipate the action of this committee, neither do I propose to speak largely on the subject of Christian union. But there are special reasons why we should seek union with you.

1. It is natural. We have a common origin and doctrine. You are our next of kin. We only seek to restore the relations in which our fathers stood.

2. We represent as none others can the Reformed church of the continent, whether in Holland, Switzerland, France, Germany, Hungary, etc. Hence, we might better be one than two. The work is vaster than we can manage. The emigration is too vast for us to deal with. They have a natural and ecclesiastical right to look to us. The infidels of Europe send their ablest men to this land, to pervert the minds and hearts of this people. But Christians must meet these men all over our vast land. We need to be one church in name, government, and jurisdiction. Could not others do that work? But the stranger looks and asks for the German church. We must assume the work, and must meet every phase of infidelity, and save these men from haunts of vice and dissipation.

But we have neither ministers nor means. We can't send our

foreign missionaries, as we cannot meet our home work. It is with us a matter of doctrine, faith, patriotism. We can do nothing better for our country than to make these men Christians. The worst thing we can do for our country is to let them frequent the lager-beer saloons. We look to the church of Holland. Eighteen years ago you rejected our Classis of North Carolina, because of slavery within its bounds. You refused to enter the South then, when the door was opened, on that account. Perhaps your action was wise, but God has removed that difficulty. We come now to you, not with one Classis, but with thirty-five, and if this question is not settled now, probably it will not be in my lifetime. We ask you to come over and help us.

My greetings are not a mere conventionalism. They express our hearty love. I notice that you are watching the times, that the floods of infidelity shall not flow over them. The Vedder Lectureship will be most useful; and you are taking great care of the liturgy. I pray God to preside over your counsels, and make you a great and powerful people, whether united with us or not. There may be difficulties; but I believe in Christ, and that His prayer for Christian union will be heard. (Applause.)

*Reply by the President.*

Dr. Van Gieson replied: You have warmed our hearts. We gladly receive you, and hear your salutations. The Synod (by its applause) has told you that already. Our associations have been most intimate. I was reminded of our condition in the days of Alva, when we were under the cross, and were unable to hold our sessions in the Netherlands. We went to Germany to hold our Synods. Then, a little later, we received the Heidelberg Catechism from you. And you had your delegates at the Synod of Dort. We have heard with gladness your blessings on us. There is no greater work than to Christianize these German immigrants. We believe that Christianity and patriotism alike must make us pray and labor for them.

I cannot say much officially what will be the outcome of this overture. As they were presented in a Christian manner, so will they be received. It is our common prayer that the Lord Jesus will conduct this whole matter for His glory, for the welfare of our land, and the interests of His kingdom.

Let me assure you and your church that we heartily reciprocate your greetings.

*Rev. Dr. Adams' Address.*

Dr. Adams said :

I am truly obliged, Mr. Moderator and brethren, for your kind and friendly greeting, and trust I shall not be considered as using formality of words if I say that I esteem it a peculiar honor and pleasure to bear the fraternal salutations to this body of the General Assembly. This is the first time I ever was permitted to look on your venerable body. Individuals associated with you I have known as personal friends. I see many familiar and radiant faces of those whom I have known as my warmest and truest friends. And then what names there are, associated with scholarship, and philanthropy, and religion, which we cherish in common. Standing here in New Brunswick, I am reminded at once of that honored man, the predecessor of the eloquent man whose voice I heard as I entered this house (Dr. Campbell). I refer to Theodore Frelinghuysen, the Greek etymology of whose Christian name suggests that he was a gift of God. I am of puritan extraction. Early in life I read, as boys read for amusement, *Diedrich Knickerbocker*, which details some curious relations between the Dutch and New England. But my maturer taste is, that that is the poorest book that Irving ever wrote. I do not believe in caricaturing the peculiarities of our ancestors. I believe we should throw the mantle of charity over their mistakes. I rejoice in my own ancestry as you rejoice in yours. My ancestry on both sides were in the May-flower. And I cannot refer to the May-flower in any way without being reminded of the abode of the pilgrims in Holland. Blood is thicker than water. Christian love is better than all wit and humor, however keen or prolix. But without wasting your precious time with preliminary words, I communicate to you at once an extract from the minutes of the General Assembly, May 26th, 1873:

"WHEREAS, We have long enjoyed fraternal relations with the General Synod of the Reformed church in America, a body holding the same doctrines and polity as ourselves; and

"WHEREAS, We have reason to believe that an organic relation with said church would be to the honor of Christ, the extension of His visible kingdom, and the better establishment of our common Presbyterianism; therefore,

"Resolved, That a committee of nine be appointed to meet a similar com-



mittee from the Reformed church, in case such a committee shall be appointed by that body in their approaching session, if that may be deemed desirable, and to report to the next General Assembly."

I know nothing of the origin of this resolution; I was not a member of the last Assembly. I feel it is an honor to bear this communication to this body. When I read it, and thought of my commission, I was reminded of the hymn,

"Be this the olive branch,  
And thou the dove;  
Go tell them that we love them  
With a brother's love."

Yesterday I took part in some public services in New York, and there were many representatives of different denominations, and one of the younger members of your body. He was so frank as to say more than I knew, that the question had actually been discussed, though he did not know what to say about it. He was like a coy maiden when the old people are deliberating. He did not think it was wise to say too much, and was afraid to say too little.

Now, this matter of making proposals on such a subject in town-meeting is rather delicate. We associate such things with quiet walks and shadowy retreats. But to show that there is nothing wrong, we do it in open court, in the eyes of all people, for there is nothing whatever to be ashamed of.

I do not know but that this is a common analogy, but it is not exactly right. For I remember reading in our old Bible that a man shall not marry his grandmother or his sister. Now, analogies are resemblances of relation. They are not exact similitudes. It is a good thing to be married, but there is a responsibility goes with it. But we must choose. A Scotch minister said to his good daughter when she was asked to marry, "Well, Jenny, it is a solemn thing to be married." "But," answered she, "it is still more solemn not to be married." I do not know the origin of the resolution. I am like Miles Standish—carrying a message for others. It is our common interest to be led to consider wisely this matter. We are called upon as Christian patriots and those who love the kingdom, to look at this matter just as Providence presents it to us.

There seems to be at present a great occasion for more of union. There have been great diversities. These are easily to be accounted

for. We have too many organizations. It is confusing. There was the General Assembly at Baltimore; then the United Presbyterian church at Pittsburg; then another Presbyterian body in Philadelphia. What does all this mean? said many. They thought the Assembly had adjourned. What is the difference between them? Dr. Adams could only tell them that he hardly knew. He could not tell the necessity of the separate existence of so many Presbyterian churches. The Reformed German and the Reformed Dutch were the same as the Reformed Presbyterian, the United Presbyterian, and the Presbyterian. In Great Britain they have the E. P. (Established Presbyterian), the U. P. (United Presbyterian), and the R. P. (Reformed Presbyterian). Some one asked why they did not call themselves the "Split peas."

But there are signs of the times, which we must observe, said Christ. They betoken something. It requires no great wisdom to interpret some of them. There is a movement like the breath of spring going over the whole world. The French and German have each given us a new word to express the idea. The word has followed the idea. Solidarity, fraternity, brotherhood and unity. These ideas are floating up and down in the world. Hence we see Masonic halls, and other bonds of union. True brotherhood and unity are desired in all relations of life. When berries and tufts of grass struck the eyes of Columbus, they told him he was approaching a new world. Fog-banks might be mistaken for land. But we must sail in the direction indicated, till we touch the solid shore.

Not only are events favorable for closer union, but for a real, hearty organic union. We look back to the beginning of the diversities. It is not difficult to account for them. It is not strange there were so many at the Reformation. That was a time of truth rather than of love. Men's fingers were then taught to war. It was all controversy, protests, hard battles. It is not strange that the differences which existed were magnified infelicitously, disastrously. But these things could not then be avoided. The circumstances made them. Fond interests clustered about single individuals. On the continent, from the emperor to the peasant, there is almost a Lutherolatry. His old shoes are preserved in Frankfort, and many other relics. The leaders of the Reformed church were never thus honored. It was truly said that the difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed was, that

the latter held to the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.

But we have been thrown across the ocean. The roots of our ancestry run across the sea, but we are placed here on a new errand, and to do a new work. Now is not a time for controversy. There is a great and well-defined hush. Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea, and were edified: and walking in the fear of God, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied.

Now, this is the peculiarity of our condition in this country. All these divine elements are brought together, for the purpose of being fused together, to form, in the language of inspiration, one new man, in Christian America. The occasion is not only favorable, but events prove that it is practicable. Love laughs at locksmiths. Where there is a will there is a way. There is great philosophy in our common proverbs. When I was asked in Edinburgh how we old and new schools united, I answered, we thought it was right to do it, and we did it. We left our talking till afterward. But Hindoo chronology would not be long enough to bring it about if all the debates are to run out their natural length, and every hair's breadth of difference to be adjusted logically and precisely. It never could be done. But there is a higher, stronger principle of Christian love, which is the best wisdom for great emergencies.

Well, we have accomplished that. It is not a matter of accident, but a providence. Dr. Paxton, here by my side, belonged to the Old school and I to the New. Do not be frightened. Dr. Paxton did not think it was wise to unite. But I would say privately to you (not to him), that now there is no man happier because of our union than Dr. Paxton. He loves us and we love him. And if any difficulty should happen again to divide us, I assure you it would not be in the old cracks. And now we are employed together, in seeking the evangelization of our whole country. A few years ago, we had plenty of the stores and enginery of war. Now we have nothing of the kind. Is it not a wondrous opportunity for improving the providence of God to labor for the salvation of men?

A certain apple-tree, beautiful, but not bearing very excellent fruit, was split in two by a storm. The owner earnestly desired to save it. He provided the means of raising the broken parts,



and bolted them together and hooped them, and it lived. And this iron produced a certain benefit. Old hoops are sometimes hung on trees, it is said, to improve the fruit. So the quality of this fruit was materially improved by the iron bolts. From being a sour, water-cored fruit, it became sweet and luscious. Now, this illustrates what is going on in our united church. We are projecting things in the spirit of Christian love, never thought of before. In listening to Dr. Campbell, in advocating Christian scholarship, and larger endowments, and every good thing, I would respond with all my heart. We all desire the elevation of our common Christianity and country.

I have spoken with freedom of these particulars. May I close, thanking you again for your kind reception of us, by simply referring to one magnificent object which Providence presents to us? Was the Christian church ever in possession of such an opportunity as that now given to us? If we do not improve it, what guilt and sadness will be upon our children! The enemies of pure religion are many, strong, and somehow they gravitate to a common centre, whatever their names may be. There were great mistakes in our common protestantism. There were too many compromises. We are free from the old question of church and State, which bothers others in their movements. The one great difficulty at the root, out of sight, sways their judgments. We are free from all that. We have all the liberty we ask. Now, cannot we correct some of the mistakes of the past? And if Protestantism was not pure in any of its forms, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed, why may it not be here, in this free air? Ought we not to unite together to convert our country to Christ? There is an old simile in all languages—Greek, Latin. It is that of a certain serpent with one head and many tails. But if there were a serpent with many heads, and going through a thicket, would it not be sure to be stopped or dismembered? But if it has one head, no matter how many tails it has, they are sure to follow that which leads and draws. We know, from the experience of the last ten years, the importance of harmony. All different opinions had to yield to the one great thought, the national life. So let it be with us. Let us forget our mere denominations, thinking only of one thing, which our father would bid us remember, if they could speak. Look in a united church for the welfare of our united country, and the promotion of the kingdom of our Lord

Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. (Applause.)

*Rev. Dr. Paxton's Address.*

Rev. Dr. Paxton said: That he was reminded of a remark of Dr. Prentiss, of a greeting he had heard on the Alps. He was under the guidance of a Swiss, and met another party, who exclaimed as they emerged from a pass, "Praised be Jesus Christ!" and the first responded, "Amen and Amen!" So we greet you to-day. One great historical church greets another. We say, praised be Jesus Christ, and you are ready to respond, Amen and Amen!

I have been trying, Mr. President, to think out the meaning of this ceremony. Each year we exchange delegates. Is it a simple act of politeness, such as you render to a neighbor, or like an act of diplomacy between nations? Or is it a spontaneous, natural expression of Christian courtesy? We have the same faith and aim. Or is there a meaning behind all this? Are these fraternal salutations an ecclesiastical device to avoid the appearance of schism? Let us lift up the curtain and inquire. Here are two bodies closely allied. So near together that marriage seems to be forbidden. But if such a close alliance, why a visible separation? How is it justifiable? When does the separation become schism? Schism is a rending of the church, like the rending of a garment. Or, if one says, I am of Paul, of Apollos, or Cephas, this was schism. In history, schism means separation from the church. Not in the sense of Rome do we mean this, for the unity of the church does not depend on submission to the Pope, or in the high Anglican sense of a historical descent of a visible organization, and if this bond be broken, then there is schism. But the evangelical churches say that the unity of the church consists in a common faith and the fellowship of the saints.

Hence, there may be separation and not schism. Otherwise we are all schismatics from Rome. You and we are separate indeed, but we have one faith. Our symbols are the same. We have endorsed the Heidelberg Catechism as one of our symbols, as you have the Westminster. Here is unity of faith. But how do we maintain the communion of the saints? This is more difficult. We have none, except in this interchange of delegates. We save the appearance of unity hereby, but scarcely. The communion

of saints only just maintained. But the question comes, does this satisfy us? We touch each other's hands once a year. But does this constitute us the unbroken body of Christ? That is the question for us to consider.

The passage of the resolutions appointing this committee of conference, brings this whole subject before us. Has not the time arrived when the distance between us should be destroyed. Our unity should be expressed in a tangible way. Let men be compelled to say, See how these brethren love one another. One of the first truths of Scripture is the unity of the church of Christ. We are baptized by one Spirit into one body. But the world wants *a priori* reasons that we are one. These reasons must be good. If our principles are different, there may be reasons for separation. Let us ask our consciences whether there is any good reason for division. Ask any one what the difference is, and they cannot tell. Dr. McLeod, in India, once asked a lone brother why he labored all alone, who answered, There are a good many reasons; but one tremendous reason is, the others sing hymns.

Are there any such tremendous things between us. You call a certain body a consistory; we call the same a session. This is a tremendous thing. We choose elders for life; you for life, with the private understanding that they will retire in two years. We are adopting this plan. Now, if we cannot put our fingers on the differences, why are we apart, giving appearances of disunion. Enemies are united, Romanists go with a bold and united front. And shall Protestant Christians stand here divided—opposing and contending—while the common enemy is in the field? Let us solemnly inquire. The marriage union was referred to. Did we come to pop the question? I don't look at it in that way. We do not propose marriage. We are already married by closer bonds. By one spirit we are all baptized into one body. We are married to His memory, and therefore to each other. We are bound by faith and affection to Christ, and therefore by the cords of grace to each other, which is the best and holiest marriage ever known in this world. We are married. But the question is this: But being married, shall we live in different houses? Is it not to the dishonor of both husband and wife? Being one, shall we come together and live as Christian people? What is our separation in the eye of the world; and what is it in the Master's eye?



These resolutions speak of organic union. We are organically united now. The Church of Christ is an organism, having one body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. It is not a voluntary society. The tie of a society is artificial, but the body and members have natural ties. Now the Church of Christ constitutes the members of the body, of which Christ is the head; and the bond is not artificial, but the natural bond of a living principle. The church is no more a society than the members of our body are such. God's Spirit in you and in me makes an organic union. We have it, therefore. Shall we express it to the world, or shall we continue to deny it? No, no! We have grand things to do in these days. We must not fritter away our abilities in these different organizations. Shall we reap the great harvest together with one heart? A great enemy is coming in like a flood. Shall we unite and go with solid front? Nelson, at Trafalgar, called together two commanders, unfriendly to each other, and pointing to the hostile fleet, said, There is your enemy. Shake hands. This is what we must do. The enemy is on every side. See his engines of destruction, and the souls he is dragging down to death. Look! Let us shake hands, unite and go forth to do the work as the Master has bidden us. (Applause.)

We represent two sections of the Presbyterian church. I resisted Presbyterian union because I did not appreciate the influence which would follow it. But God effected that union; now I am surprised at the results. The evils dreaded did not happen, but many good results unexpected have been realized. The testimony of Dr. Adams is true. You can't see the seam. We never could split again in the old seams. I formerly knew Dr. Adams before we united, and esteemed him as a brother. We shook hands, but I knew little of him. He was New school and I Old, but with the union a new affection sprung up. When Dr. Adams was sick last summer, he was in my thoughts all the time. I prayed for him, and when in the fall he returned with renewed health, I could not refrain from throwing my arms around him. That was the effect of union. Now we may politely pay our salutations to each other. But it is better to get our arms around one another, and then the Everlasting arms will be about us both. (Applause.)

*The President's Reply.*

Dr. Van Gieson replied: My dear friends, we have gladly

heard you, and received the cordial Christian salutations of the venerable beloved sister church, of which you stand before us as the representatives. We know that you honor the name of your church, and, as you say, Christ be praised, so we say again. I remember that our delegate to you said: Mr. Moderator, I think I have seen you before. So I have seen you before in some of the most tender pastoral duties. I have ministered to members of your churches when out of the city. In the death chamber we have stood side by side.

Your assembly conferred honor upon us when it selected Dr. Crosby as its moderator. The President then alluded to the Dort chair, and the processes of sitting, setting, and incubation, employed by Mr. Ganse, in his speech before the assembly. Our ministers pass from church to church. There is no boundary-line. There may be a distinction, but there is little real difference.

We have received delegates from several Presbyterian churches: from the United Presbyterians of Scotland, and the United Presbyterians of the United States; from the lately divided, but now united Presbyterian church. It has been raining United Presbyterianism. To us the shower has been very refreshing, and in that United Presbyterianism there may be an augury. It is not for me to say what may take place. In the course of the formation of language, the idea comes first, and the word after the idea. But this is not always so. The seed of the woman, the lion of the tribe of Judah, the Wonderful, the Messiah, and similar words, vibrated from human lips, before He came, in whom they were all fulfilled.

And, as it was with the head, so with the members. We know not what is in His mind. What are the designs of Providence? There are struggles in many human hearts which we see and feel. Since we are alike, we earnestly pray and desire that God may direct us in such a way as will best promote His glory and the efficiency of His kingdom. But I speak officially, and hence I cannot say all that I would. I cannot tell what will be the result. There have been references to the marriage tie, and the body of Christians, and the coyness of the maiden. It may not be amiss to say that maidens are coy and shy in proportion to their ancientness. We are not so young as we once were. We are disposed to proceed with all discretion, but with all honesty and Christian love. We thank God for the union between our two bodies. It

was a day of joy for Christians everywhere. The fruit of that tree was good before the two parts were brought together. It cannot be much improved. May God bless all measures of peace and concord which His Spirit inspires in the hearts of His people.

The Moravian brethren had a touching custom of giving the right hand of fellowship. I give you my right hand, and wish I had two right hands. And these hands represent the right hands of every member of this assembly. God bless the Presbyterian Church of America. May her shadow never be less ! May the cross through her grow brighter and brighter, till the whole land be filled with its radiance !

The Rev. Dr. E. T. Baird, from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (South), was introduced, and spoke as follows :

*Address by Rev. E. T. Baird, D.D.*

*Mr. President, Fathers and Brethren :* I esteem it a high privilege and an especial honor to be permitted to appear before this venerable Synod as the delegate from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, commonly called the Southern General Assembly ; and in the name of my brethren to wish you grace, mercy and peace from Jesus Christ, your Lord and ours. There are but few of you whom it has been my privilege to meet before ; yet I do not feel myself a stranger among you. The names of many of the fathers and brethren of this Synod are well known among us, and are familiar as household words, since their praise is in all our churches. Though somewhat distant from you, we are not unobservant spectators of your eminent services in the cause of Christ and of your noble institutions and Boards. In all your labor and trials you have our constant sympathy and love.

But there are special reasons why I consider it a privilege to be here. It is because our hearts turn to you as they do to none others. Your delegate to Little Rock (Dr. Stitt) was pleased to say that he was met with a cordiality and affection that surprised him ; because such manifestations are usually the result of long intercourse, and are of slow growth. Well, sir, I can explain the reason of this attachment and sympathy. It requires me to refer to sad memories and days of darkness ; but I can do so, I hope, without reviving anything unpleasant.

Our General Assembly was organized in 1861. Although we



are not very old as a church, yet we are entitled to the supremacy, so far as age is concerned. I have heard a good deal said on your floor about *the* Presbyterian church, when allusion was manifestly made to the General Assembly which recently met in Baltimore. Now, that General Assembly only dates back to 1871; whereas, we go back ten years earlier; so that if either body has a right to claim to be the Presbyterian church, *par excellence*, I think the claim belongs to us on account of our antiquity. (A laugh.)

Well, sir, in 1861, at our first Assembly, we addressed a circular letter to all the churches of Jesus Christ throughout the earth, in which we expressed an earnest wish to be on terms of fellowship with them all, but especially those of the same household of faith. But there came no response. When that bloody war came to an end in 1865, and in the midst of poverty we gathered together in General Assembly at Macon, Georgia, we once more made overtures to our brethren of other churches for recognition and for fellowship. We met under sad circumstances. Our churches were much scattered; many of our choicest ministers were dead; our agencies for the work of foreign and domestic missions, education and publication, were without means; and we came there to act for an impoverished people. Public communication had not been fully reopened, and we had no means of ascertaining each other's views; yet all were of one mind. We reëstablished all our committees, and resolved in the strength of God to go forward. Many dear brethren outside of our bounds feared that we would give way to discouragement, and would falter in our work; but when they heard that there was not a wavering voice nor a feeble step in our whole Assembly, they gave thanks and sang praises to God. One distinguished minister, who had feared for us and prayed for us, told me that when he heard of our action and unfaltering purpose, the form that Nebuchadnezzar saw flashed across his mind. Said Nebuchadnezzar, "Did not we cast those men bound into the midst of the fire?" His counselors answered, "True, O King!" Then said Nebuchadnezzar, "Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the son of God!" Yes, sir, we felt that that *fourth one* was present with us; and up to this hour we have great reason to believe He is present with us still.

Well, when the armies of the United States brought to an end that war in which we had risked everything and lost everything,

we bowed our heads reverently to the majesty and will of God. And then we turned our eyes toward our Christian brethren from whom we had been separated in matters belonging to the State and politics, hoping for fellowship and sympathy in things pertaining to the kingdom of Christ. We felt that they had been as honest and conscientious in maintaining the principles for which they had contended as we had been ourselves. And we did suppose that their Christian charity might rise high enough to pass over that great chasm which had been filled with the slain bodies of the choicest of our brethren and the noblest of our youth, and extend to us the same credit for conscientious fidelity to principle and duty which we had extended to them. But sad was our disappointment. From the place whence above all others we expected sympathy, fellowship and succor in the midst of our calamities, came angry looks, knit brows, and words that were not words of love. We then looked across the waters, and in 1866 we appointed Drs. Girardeau, Hoge and Palmer, chosen brethren, to bear our salutations to the churches of Great Britain and the Continent. Before going, like prudent men, they instituted inquiries to ascertain with how much cordiality they would be received. From a minister in Ireland the answer was, "Do not allow those men to enter the three kingdoms, if you can help it." From a distinguished minister in Scotland the message was, "I will divide the Assembly on their reception, if they venture to come." A similar message came from England. We were not brethren, we were not Christians; they called us "men." Thank God for that much. And now we had exhausted our duty, we were shut up to ourselves, and there were none to hold fellowship with us and aid us in all the church militant. We were content, however, with the manifestations which we enjoyed that the fourth one whom Nebuchadnezzar saw was our Captain and Rear Guard. Thus we stood alone, and no words of full fellowship, cordial sympathy and fraternal confidence reached us, until your beloved delegate (Dr. Todd) stood on our floor in 1871, and made our hearts glad by your messages of love, and thus caused our pent-up affections to flow forth toward you. (Applause.) And hence, when you subsequently sent to us your distinguished delegates, Drs. Van Zandt and Stitt, our hearts and hands gave them that cordiality of reception of which they have spoken.

At our recent assembly, Dr. Stitt presented the action which

this Synod took at its last meeting with reference to forming closer relations with us. We had heard of them through the public journals; and though some doubted their feasibility, there was no heart in our bounds which was not touched by this manifestation of your love. Dr. Wilson told you last year that he had dreamed that something might be done to draw us closer together. You had given form and shape to the dream, and had pointed out a hope of its realization in actual history. There were none among us who did not wish our relations to be made closer. And when the question came before our recent assembly, on appointing a committee to confer with you, the vote was taken by rising, and every member arose to his feet. Dr. Wilson was then called on to lead in prayer and thanksgiving, while there were but few dry eyes in the house. At that time I had no difficulty in understanding the meaning, nor in estimating the value of those ceremonies, invested with the interchange of delegates. The feeling of my heart was

"Blest be the tie that binds  
Our hearts in Christian love."

Yes, sir, my feeling went further still, and my heart said:

"The fellowship of kindred minds  
Is like to that above."

I then realized what was the meaning of true Christian unity, and had no difficulty in understanding that it might exist without outward conformity. On that subject, with the creed I would say, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, *the communion of saints.*"

In connection with this, Mr. President, I have been requested to explain a matter which I wish to do as delicately as possible, because I do not wish you to be annoyed by what only concerns us. The action concerning our assembly which was taken by the assembly at Baltimore, has been misunderstood. That action did originate at St. Louis, but the paper prepared at St. Louis was not adopted as originally drafted. All the peculiarities of it which its authors designed to meet the case of our difficulties were stricken out or altered. Moreover, the reports about the action of the assembly at Little Rock, in response to that paper are wholly false. It was passed at Baltimore on Wednesday, and our assembly adjourned on Thursday, near midnight. But it was not telegraphed to us, and we never heard of it, until we saw the



papers from Memphis and St. Louis on our way home. I have no commission to say what our assembly may do about it, but I feel sure it will be disposed to do what is for the honor and glory of God, and the best interests of the church, and that it will study the things that make for peace. You see the dispatches on this subject, published in the papers, and bearing date at Little Rock, were manifestly written in New York or Baltimore, by some enterprising reporter, who wished to be in advance with the news. (A laugh.)

A few words about our church. As I have said, when the war was over we were without funds, but we nevertheless reorganized all our agencies and went to work. Now, our Committee of Foreign Missions has two missions in China, one in Italy, two in Brazil, and one in Columbia, and also missions among four tribes of Indians. There are more than two hundred ministers aided by our Committee of Sustentation; they are one hundred and twenty students aided by our Educational Committee, and our Publication Committee has assets to the amount of over \$41,000. Nor has it ever cost the church a cent. It has paid its way, and increased the capital nearly \$5000. These are great results for us, whereof our hearts are glad.

I have, Sir, watched with interest the proceedings of your Synod, and have heard of your great enterprises, and the noble work you are accomplishing by your institutions of learning. In all that you are attempting, the church which I represent wishes you God-speed.

With regard to the resolutions adopted by our assembly at Little Rock, touching the establishment of closer relations with you, I have no mission to speak. The assembly referred the matter to an able committee, and it would be unbecoming in me to trench on their duties. I may say, however, that our people are watching your action, to see whither these things will tend, and are ready to obey every heavenly vision. I think they are ready to draw our relations as close as they can be drawn, without sacrificing anything which we hold to be precious, or any of the venerable traditions which either of us may deem sacred. I trust God will guide in the whole matter, and will bring to pass such results as will promote the best interests of His church. There is danger, it may be, in a church becoming too large, as well as in being too small. If too small, it may lack efficiency, and if too large, the

power must fall into the hands of a few, and practical episcopacy be established. If it shall be deemed best for us not to be united in closer relations, there will be no schism, no division, no disagreement between us, no enmity, no opposition.

I have been privately asked, suppose the Reformed church should unite with the Northern Presbyterian church, what effect would it have on the Southern church? I have no commission to discuss that question, and cannot anticipate the decision. But I think I can illustrate our position. About twenty years ago, some spiritualists requested Dr. N. L. Rice to unite with them in the discovery of the harmonial philosophy! Dr. Rice said he had no time to engage in discovering the thing, but when it was discovered, if they would bring it to him, he would take a look at it, and then tell them what he thought of it. Well, sir, if you become merged or submerged into another church, after you become harmonized I think we will be ready to take a look at you, and will then tell you what we think of you. (Laughter and applause.) I feel confident that whatever may occur in your future history, nothing will happen to diminish your peculiar excellencies, or tarnish your fair name—that you will ever be as zealous for the faith and as earnest in effort as you now are. That faith which you love, and which is expressed in the very name of your church, is ours also. We love the Reformed doctrines, and the name of Reformed belongs to us, as well as you. The Presbyterian church of Scotland is the Reformed church of Scotland. The contests in Scotland were on the subject of church government with Episcopacy and Independency; and hence our ancestors had to raise high the Presbyterian banner, and unfurl the name. But that noble church was as zealous for the Reformed faith as for Presbyterian order, and we love your name as expressive of our doctrines as much as we love the Presbyterian name, which is expressive of our polity. Moreover, sir, we have an inheritance in your standards. Your confession of faith was ratified at the Synod of Dort, which Synod was composed of representatives of the Belgic churches, aided by divines from the Reformed churches of France, Germany, and Great Britain. Hence, in the profession of the faith, and in the practice of the order of God's house, which is common to us both, we can walk together in the unity of the spirit, which is the bond of peace.

I thank you, Mr. President and brethren, for your patient hearing.

*Reply by the President.*

Dr. Van Gieson replied: Permit me to assure you that we gladly receive and heartily reciprocate the affection of your church, which has been so felicitously expressed by you. I can say without hypocrisy, and without partiality, that we have had great pleasure in receiving such salutations from other bodies, but especially from you. Among all the duties before us in this world, none surpass the duties of childhood. We feel this more and more as we pass on in years. We delight, as the church which dates its age by centuries, to welcome the juvenile church from which you come. And we will pray that you, like a certain child, may grow in stature, and in wisdom, and in favor with God and man. I thank you for refraining from any allusion to the sad memory of those days gone by. Let them be buried in oblivion. God help you and us to do what lies in our power to that end.

You speak of distance. Love laughs at distances as it does at locksmiths. We have salutations from over seas and mountains. Distance is nothing between those who have the same love to a common Lord. Some of the tribes lived on one side of the Jordan, and some on the other. But those on the other side were none the less Israel. They worship in one temple, one Lord, and the very sea is now narrowed down to Jordan. We have been shaking hands across the seas, and therefore much more easily with you. We are part and parcel of a common country. I read in prophecy that the Lord will one day shake His hand over the rivers, and smite the streams, so that men shall go over dry-shod.

We need not speak as to the methods by which our affection may be expressed, or closer alliances formed. We must leave details to others. But for the Synod and our church, I give you the right hand of Christian fellowship. And it is our prayer that the Lord may find more and more spiritual prosperity to the dear brethren in whose name you come.

---

—The Karen Theological School at Rangoon, has now an average of one hundred pupils.



## REGENERATION BY BAPTISM.

*A Review of the New Theology Doctrine.*

## ART. II.—THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT.

Let the points in controversy be definitely kept in view, and the argument held strictly to what the new (Nevinite) theology teaches on the subject. Mr. Rupp, representing that theology, and endorsed by its leading advocates, contends:

1. That the substance of the soul of man, as originally created, is an emanation from the very substance of God. (See proofs in the June number.)
2. That as this original God-substance was lost, or corrupted by the *fall* of man through sin, a fresh emanation or transmission of the God-substance is necessary to man's redemption.
3. That to procure or secure this, God (the Logos, the Eternal Word, God the Son) entered into an organic conjunction *of His nature* with human nature. The result or product of this conjunction, was a *theanthropic* (that is God-man) *nature*, the substance of which is an organic combination of the substance of the God nature, and the substance of human nature. From this compounded theanthropic nature issues, or is transmitted, the substance said to be communicated to men, as the means or basis of their redemption.
4. The emanation or communication of this substance, is regeneration.
5. Baptism is the channel through which this is done, and by which, therefore, regeneration is effected.

This plain, direct statement of the new theology doctrine, might seem a sufficient refutation of it. But an attempt is, professedly, made to defend it; and first by the New Testament.

Let us follow up the attempt.

*The New Testament Proofs Examined.*

In the first place an attempt is made to support the new\* doctrine. The attempt will be found to be an utter failure.

---

\*Whenever the Nevinite theology is spoken of as *new*, it will be understood that we mean *new* for the Reformed church, and for Evangelical Christianity in general. It is really an old error revived, and perhaps somewhat modified.

What was it necessary for Mr. Rupp, or any of that school, to prove, by their appeal to the Scriptures? Plainly these two things: 1. That regeneration is an emanation of a part of the substance of the theanthropic nature of Christ, transmitted to man. 2. That this substance is transmitted through Baptism. Does he prove these points? This is the question. Can they be supported by the Scriptures?

Now our friend, who in this case represents the new theology, need not fear at all that he will be required, in his attempted proof, to furnish from the Bible, O. or N. T., "a logical definition, either of the sacraments in general, or of Baptism in particular." No such definition is demanded. There is too much *real* logic in the Scriptures to allow of *formal* logic, or to render such formal logic necessary. At the same time the facts and truths of the Bible are not stated so vaguely, are not so pliant, that any sophist can fairly prove his point from them, or that every potter can mould them, legitimately, to suit his own taste.

But, on the other hand, we cannot allow our friend, Mr. Rupp, to follow, unchallenged, the example of the chief leader or leaders of his school, by imputing views to those whom he opposes, which they do not hold. He does this, unhappily for him, that the theory of those who denounce the Nevinite doctrine, *must* be that "the sacrament is simply the sign of an absent grace, a grace that stands in no inward connection with the sacrament itself." This *must not*, necessarily, by any means be their view. If Mr. R. can see no other alternative, it is simply his misfortune, not the fault of those whom he thus, doubtless unintentionally, misrepresents. But he is not the first who could see only the side of the house on which he stood, and would not change his position so as to see the other side also.

After some rather unfair preliminary assertions of this sort, he proceeds to examine *somewhat in detail*, he says, the teaching of the New Testament. This *detailed* examination, however, is found to be limited to but seven passages. Of course an earnest effort is made to discover the desired doctrine in these passages. The failure of the effort is so manifest that one might reasonably have expected a surrender of the point, and a hearty return to the old Apostolic Reformed faith on the subject.

*John 3: 1-6.*

The case of Nicodemus is the first proof cited. The passage is

familiar, and is one to which the advocates of the new theology always make their chief appeal.

What do they need to prove by it, in order to make it support their theory? Evidently the two points named on the preceding page, viz. : That regeneration is the emanation and transmission of a portion of the substance of Christ's (so-called) theanthropic nature, and that this is transmitted literally through Baptism. Is this done by them? Not at all. It is not even attempted to *show* that the passage teaches anything of the sort. Mr. Rupp examines it about as thoroughly as any of his party or predecessors has ever done, and makes the best of it for his purpose. But he finds nothing at all in it to warrant even an allusion to his God-substance emanation or transmission theory, excepting under the very ambiguous figurative phrase : "The implantation in the soul by the Holy Ghost of a *germ* of a new and spiritual life, *derived from Him*, who is Himself the Head of the Kingdom of God and the Prince of life." Here, as any one can see, there is a significant abatement of the bold assertion about an *emanation of the substance of God*, &c., and a manifest sense of the difficulty of getting anything to favor that assertion out of what our Lord says to Nicodemus.

But, finely as the phraseology just quoted may sound, and handsomely as it may seem to cover up the naked substance emanation theory—where, in the whole passage, can any word or phrase be found to support *that theory*? It will not do, of course, merely to quote the passage, or any part of it, and then boldly say : *there it is*—not even if such an assertion could be backed by the authority of Drs. Nevin, Higbee, Gans, Apple and Gerhart. Have *they ever proven* that the passage teaches their doctrine? No matter how positively and authoritatively they may cite the passage as on their side, it is still fair to hold even them to the proof.

This, however, is just what they shrink from attempting. To say, as they do, and as Mr. Rupp does, that "by the new birth the Lord could *not* have meant simply repentance, or a change of heart and mind," is not to the point. What is needed is to show, to prove, what He *does* mean ; not what He does *not* mean. And when Mr. R. (like the rest of his friends) rushes from this denial of a sense he rejects to a sense he prefers, he simply leaps from a spurned negative to an *assumed* positive assertion. He takes for



granted the very thing to be proven. In other words, he utterly fails to make out his case. He does not show that the doctrine of the passage is the doctrine of his school.

Of course the passage teaches the necessity of regeneration, and it speaks of regeneration in some connection with water baptism. Nobody disputes that. But this does not help Mr. Rupp's argument or theory. And yet this help is what is needed. Until this is done, all that may be said over and over again about baptism *not* being merely this, or merely that, or about the new birth being, as a rule, inseparably connected with baptism, amounts to mere empty and irrelevant assertion.

Here we might let this particular instance rest. It is clearly not our business to show what the passage does mean. All that can be fairly demanded of us is to point out the fact that Mr. Rupp has not proven his point.

But we are willing to go beyond this, and show that the passage *does not mean*, and could not have been understood to mean, what Nevinism teaches on the subject of regeneration by baptism.

1. It is well known that no such doctrine as that of man, or the soul of man, being a part of the very substance of God, was held by the Jews of that day. Greatly as their leading teachers had erred from the truth revealed to them, such a pantheistic emanation error was never entertained by them. Some of their heathen neighbors held the absurd and hurtful notion (as may be seen, for instance, in the Zend Avesta.) But the Jews had learned more correct views of the relation of the Creator to the creative. Even when they contemplated God as their heavenly *Father*, they expressed themselves in terms which show that they had far more lofty and profound conceptions of the *Fatherhood of God*, than to think of it as implying (organically) any impartation of the ineffably exalted and holy eternal *substance* of the God-head to the production of His power. As they regarded God, He was not so (organically) bound to His creatures, whether angels or men. In all their sacred writings, inspired and uninspired (as the Apocryphal books), God, in His substantial nature, stands not merely supreme, but alone, so that none can be likened to Him, or He to any one, in heaven or on earth.

2. All that is said in the O. T. scriptures, as the Jews possessed them, with reference to the *new birth*, or which can be regarded as having any bearing on the subject, is in the plainest contradic-

tion with the Nevinite doctrine of the impartation of a fresh portion of the very substance of God, of an emanation in such sense or form from God to man. They indeed know of "a new heart and a right spirit," and most solemnly press home to the consciences of those addressed the need of a thorough renewal of the inner man. But the renewal, the regeneration demanded, is always named as that *of man as he is*, as that of the *very elements* which constituted his natural and spiritual (physical and psychical) being. The very nature which had been depraved, polluted by sin, was to be cleansed and restored. The very heart (of stone) petrified towards God by iniquity, was to be made a heart of flesh. Jehovah is represented as having such power over the spirits and hearts of men, kings as well as subjects, that He can reach and renovate them without the need of material substantial organs, and, still more, without transfusing them with His own divine substance, and so making them *substantially* (organically) His children. Not thus was He a Father unto Israel, and in no *such* sense would He cause them by His grace to say: Surely Thou art our Father, though Abraham knew us not.

Whatever the true import may be of such terms as *new heart* and *new spirit*, they are plainly assumed to mean something entirely consistent with those other demands which require men to cleanse and renovate their own hearts and lives, but which on the Nevinite theory they could not be required to do. Nicodemus, therefore, as a teacher in Israel, could have had no such conceit in his mind.

3. Neither was there anything in the phrases, "born again," "born from above," or "born of water and the Spirit," which our Lord employed, to convey any such thought to his mind, even had he been far more spiritually minded than he seems to have been. With the first two he was of course familiar, as Mr. Rupp admits. It may be assumed that even the third was not strange to him. What staggered and perplexed him was the evident fact that the Lord used the phraseology *as applied to a born Jew* in some peculiar sense. Nicodemus could understand that a Gentile converted to Judaism must pass through what was forcibly and appropriately called *a regeneration*. He knew well what regeneration meant when the term was so applied. He was at no loss either to understand the figure of speech by which the *baptism* (or ceremonial washing) of such proselytes from heathenism was called

their regeneration. What perplexed him was, that *an Israelite by birth* needed to pass through any such process, and especially that such an Israelite needed regeneration by the Spirit. So ignorant was he of his real moral state, of the blindness of his eyes, and of the hardness of his heart. For *this* the Lord justly chided him. A teacher of the law and the prophets, who might be presumed to have earnestly studied both, and to be acquainted with what they taught of the need of a new heart and a right spirit, should not have been surprised at Jesus' words.

But if the terms "born again," &c., used by the Lord, meant what the new theology party say they mean, how could Nicodemus have understood them. Neither Moses nor Malachi, nor any of the prophets between them, could have understood those terms to mean: except there emanate from Me, the God-man, a germinal portion of my own substance, and it be infused into you, to take the place of the original, natural substance of your life, and you be *thus* regenerated, you cannot see the kingdom of heaven.

And yet the theory we are reviewing requires (shall we say with unconscious and inconsiderate profaneness?) that Nicodemus should have so understood the saying of the Lord.

This, we think, will suffice to show that John 3: 1-6 affords no comfort to the new theology doctrine of regeneration by baptism in their sense.

What the passage does teach upon the subject, it is not our *present* business to show. That task is reserved for another time, not evaded. To attempt it now would only turn the reader's attention from the matter in hand, viz: to show that Mr. Rupp and his school fail to prove their peculiar doctrine by the Bible, and only deceive themselves with the effort to do so, by appealing to passages like John 3: 1-6.

*Matthew 28: 18-20.*

Is the next Scripture quoted in support of the new doctrine. It is the commission of our Lord to His disciples, commanding and empowering them to bear the Gospel to all nations. In using this passage, the new-order party lay all stress upon the meaning of the Greek word translated "*teach*" both in our English and German versions. They say it should be translated "*disciple*," or "*make disciples*;" and this they then claim is commanded to be done by "*baptizing them*." Hence, they argue that the Saviour



taught that men are to be made disciples of Christ by *baptism*. But, they further argue, as no one can become a true disciple of Christ without regeneration, the Lord must have meant to teach that regeneration is effected by baptism. Therefore water baptism secures regeneration.

This is, of course, making very short work of the argument. If the case were as plainly on their side as they seem to think it, there would be an end to discussion. Few persons, however, not previously committed to the new-order theory, will fail to see that several important points are *assumed* in the above interpretation and mode of reasoning.

Now, there is a simple and fair way of ascertaining the true import of the Saviour's language, and deciding the case in hand, so far as this particular passage is concerned. This may and should be done :

1. By considering the true sense of the principal term employed, that is, *teach*, (in the Greek, *matheteusate*.) What does the *word*, taken literally, or taken in usual sense as employed at the time, mean? Our new-order friends say it properly means *disciple*, or *make disciples*. Well, suppose we yield this ; then, of course, the question arises, what was meant in our Lord's day by *discipling* a person, or making a disciple of him? Here it is the truth comes in. To be a disciple was to be a *learner* ; to make a disciple was to *instruct a person*, and get him consent to be instructed, or to convince him of the truth which was taught him, and to lead him to embrace that truth, and to become an avowed follower of Him whose truth it was. That this is the true sense of the *word* is clear from the fact that it is derived from a word (*manthano*) which means to learn, to understand, to be informed. And as there were leading teachers of different schools of religion or philosophy, in that age (as now), those who put themselves under the tuition of one of those teachers, or was persuaded to accept of His teaching and doctrine, were called His disciples, that is, those who learned of Him. Thus, Plato had disciples, and other Greek philosophers. In the same sense there were *disciples* of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

If only Mr. Rupp and his fellow-*disciples* of Dr. Nevin had looked somewhat more closely to the Scriptures on this very point, it might have saved them from a misinterpretation of the Scripture meaning of that term. For instance, in Matt. 11 : 29, Jesus

uses the word (Mathete) in the sense we claim for it. And in John 9: 28 the Pharisees accuse the blind man restored to sight of being a *disciple* (mathetes) of Jesus before He was baptized, and because he held to the doctrine of Jesus, or to Jesus as his teacher, whilst they assert that *they* were Moses' disciples (Mathetai) because *they* held to Moses as their teacher. Furthermore, they might have seen that in Matthew 10: 1, &c., the twelve are called *disciples* of Jesus, though they had not yet been baptized as such with water Baptism.

To disciple, then, means to teach, instruct; and to make a *disciple*, means to persuade or morally constrain one to be willing to be taught, and be indoctrinated by some one, and in some formal way, by some suitable form of profession to acknowledge and to follow some one as a Teacher, Master. Accordingly, Mr. Rupp, Dr. Nevin, &c., may read, by turning to Luke 14: 26, 27, 33, that it is *not by Baptism* that men become disciples, or are disciplined, or are made disciples, but by those very moral (subjective) personal qualities and qualifications which the school they represent is so bold in setting aside, and even denouncing, as conditions of discipleship: "whosoever doth bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my *disciple*" (mathetes), even though he may have been baptized.

2. Another way of finding out the true sense of the passage, now under notice, is to see how the Apostles, the immediate disciples of our Lord, became such. That it was not by Baptism, but by "forsaking all and following Him," (as Peter says in Matthew 19: 27,) will hardly be denied. Until it is denied, it may be taken for granted.

3. One more way of getting at the true sense of the passage, is by *ascertaining how the Apostles themselves understood their Master's words*. This may be best learned by noticing how they carried out the terms of the great commission. Of this we have ample evidence in the book of Acts. And how did they proceed, what method did they adopt? Turn to Acts 2: 14, &c., and we find that the preaching of the Gospel, and in full detail as to all fundamental facts and truths, was the first thing. *Then*, when that had taken deep hold of the conscience and heart of those addressed, so that as men smitten with convictions of sin, and despairing of help in themselves, they cried out: *What shall we do; then*, and not till then, were they told, *first to repent*, and *on repenting*, to be

baptized. This method is reported as the one uniformly adopted. (See Acts 3: 12; &c.; 8: 4, 5; 10: 34; 14: 1; &c., &c.)

Finally, the parallel passages in the other Gospels, giving the Lord's commission to the apostles, prove that Mr. Rupp, and the party he represents, utterly mistake the sense of the passage in Matthew. Thus in Mark (16: 15—17) we read: "And Jesus said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believe not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe," &c. Now, if the great work of the apostles was to be to make disciples of men by baptizing them, St. Mark overlooked or was ignorant of the fact. He and Matthew do not, in that case, agree. We believe, however, that both the Evangelists fully agree, but that Mr. Rupp and his side misinterpret the gospel.

St. Luke (24: 46—47) does not report the commission in form. He gives it, however, in substance, and that in language which bears very strongly against the construction put upon Matthew by the new order school. The statement in Luke is: "And (Jesus) said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that *repentance and remission of sins should be preached* in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This is clearly given as the substance of what is recorded in the passage in Matthew. And yet there is not only nothing said of making disciples by baptism, but baptism is not even named.

Thus far, then, the appeal made to the New Testament fails to give any encouragement to the theory of regeneration, in the Nevinite sense, by baptism. What Mr. Rupp needed to prove was that regeneration is an emanation or impartation of a new portion of the substance of God to man, and that this is effected by baptism. He has utterly failed to produce any proof of this from the passages thus far considered, or to prove that any substance—divine, angelic, or of any other kind—is conveyed to the soul, as the principle of regeneration, in and through baptism.

Other Scriptures quoted by him will be considered in our next number.

---

A GERMAN Presbyterian church has been organized in Chicago.



THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

CHAPTER XXI.

*Of the Holy Supper of the Lord.*

THE Supper of the Lord, which is called the Table of the Lord, and Eucharist, that is, an action of thanks-giving, is called Supper, from this ground, because it was instituted by Christ in that His last supper (now yet represented thereby), and in it believers are spiritually fed and nourished. 1 Cor. 11: 21; Matt. 26: 20-26; Mark. 14: 17-22.

The author of the Supper of the Lord is not an angel or man, but the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, who consecrated it for His church. And this sanctification, or consecration, is of force always for those who celebrate no other supper than that which the Lord initiated; at which the words of the Lord are repeated, and in all things the glance is directed to one Christ in true faith; from whose hands we also receive that which we receive through the ministry of the church. 1 Cor. 11: 20.

By this sacred rite the Lord will have preserved in fresh remembrance that great benefit shown to the human race, namely, that by the gift of His body, and through the shedding of His blood, He has remitted all our sins, has redeemed us from eternal death and the power of the devil, and now feeds us with His flesh, and nourishes us with His blood, which, apprehended spiritually by a true faith, preserves us unto life eternal. And this great benefit is renewed as often as the supper is celebrated. For the Lord said (Luke 22: 19) "Do this in remembrance of Me."

By this sacred supper there is also sealed unto us, that the body of the Lord was truly given for us, and His blood shed for the remission of our sins, that our faith may not waver. Outwardly and visibly this is administered by the minister in the Sacrament, and as it were, laid before our very eyes to be seen, which is, inwardly in the soul, invisibly performed by the Holy Ghost. Outwardly we receive bread from the minister, and hear the words of the Lord (Mark 14: 22-24), take, eat, this is My body; take it and divide it amongst you; drink ye all of it, this is My blood. Thus, believers, receive that which is given by the minister of the Lord, and eat the bread of the Lord, and drink of the Lord's cup. But yet, by the operation of Christ through the Holy Spirit, they

inwardly receive the body and blood of the Lord ; and are nourished by them unto life eternal. For the flesh and blood of Christ is the meat and drink unto everlasting life. Christ himself, in so far as He was delivered for us, and is our Saviour, is the principal thing in the supper ; and we suffer nothing to be put into His stead. John 6 : 55.

But that it may be better and more clearly understood how the body and blood of Christ are a meat and drink unto believers, and are received by them unto everlasting life, we will add a few words. There is more than one kind of eating. There is a bodily eating, whereby the food is taken into the mouth, masticated by the teeth and swallowed. Those of Capernaum once thought that they should eat the flesh of the Lord in this way, but they were confuted by the Lord. John 6 : 52. For as the flesh of Christ cannot be eaten bodily without wickedness and cruelty, so it is no meat for the body, as all must confess. Hence, we reject that canon in the Pope's decrees, *Ego Berengarius: De Consecrat, disto 2*. For neither did pious antiquity believe, nor do we, that Christ's body can be eaten corporeally, or essentially, with the bodily mouth.

There is also a spiritual eating of the body of Christ ; not indeed such a one, as though the meat itself were transformed into spirit, but such, whereby the body and the blood of the Lord preserves its substance and property, and is spiritually communicated to us ; so that not in a corporeal but in a spiritual manner (namely, through the Holy Ghost) there is applied and bestowed upon us all that has been prepared for us by the giving of Christ unto death, namely, forgiveness of sins, redemption and life everlasting. Thereby Christ now lives in us and we in Him, and through true faith we become partakers of *Him* who is our spiritual meat and drink, of Him who is our life.

For bodily meat and drink strengthen, and not only make our bodies strong, but preserve them alive ; so, also, the flesh of Christ given for us, and His blood shed for us, vivify and not only make our souls strong, but also preserve them alive ; not in so far as they are corporeally eaten by us, but in so far as they are spiritually communicated by the Spirit of God ; since the Lord Himself says (John 6 : 52, 53) "The bread *which I will give* is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world ;" and in another passage, (John 6 : 63) "The flesh (*i. e.* that corporeally eaten) profiteth nothing

it is the Spirit which maketh alive ; and the *words* which I speak unto you, they are *spirit and life*." For as by eating we must appropriate the food, that it may become effectual in us, and manifest its strength, (since while it is without us, it profits us nothing,) so necessary is it also that we should believingly receive Christ, that we may appropriate Him, and that He may live in us and we in Him. For He has said (John 6 : 31, 51, 57) " I am the bread of life ; he that cometh with Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in Me shall never thirst." From all which it is plain, that by the spiritual eating we by no means mean a mere imaginary thing ; but the very body of the Lord, which has been offered for us, which yet is not received by the believer corporeally, but spiritually, through faith. Therein we follow, above all, our Lord and Redeemer's own teaching in John 6.

This eating of the body, and drinking of the blood of the Lord is so necessary, that without it no one can be preserved. But this spiritual eating and drinking also takes place outside of the Supper of the Lord, wherever and as often as a man believes in Christ ; to which probably this expression of Augustine has reference : " Why preparest thou teeth and belly ? Believe and thou hast eaten."

Besides this spiritual eating, there is also a sacramental eating of the body of the Lord, wherein the believer not only participates spiritually in the true body and blood of the Lord, but also by coming to the table of the Lord receives outwardly the visible Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. Already before this, when he believed, the believer received the life-giving food, and still enjoys it ; but just for this reason he receives something more, when he receives the Sacrament. For he makes progress in the continued communication of the body and blood of the Lord ; faith becomes enkindled more and more, and grows, strengthened by the spiritual nourishment.

As long as we live faith has constant increase. And he who ordinarily, in true faith, receives the sacrament, receives not only the signs, but enjoys, as we have said, the thing signified. Moreover, he is obedient to the institution and command of the Lord, and with joyful heart gives thanks for his own redemption and that of all mankind. He celebrates the joyful memorial of the death of the Lord ; and before the whole church testifies of whose body he is a member. And to those who receive the sacrament



this also is sealed, that the body of Christ was offered and his blood was shed, not only for the human race in general, but that specially it is meat and drink to *every single* believing communicant. Gal. 2: 20. But as for him who goes to the table of the Lord without faith, he partakes only of the outward sacrament, and does not receive the matter (or essence) of the sacrament, in which is life and salvation, and such eat unworthily of the table of the Lord. But (1 Cor. 11: 27-29) "whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." For they do not approach with true faith; they do despite unto the death of Christ, and therefore they eat and drink condemnation to themselves.

Therefore we do not so join the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, that we say, the bread is the body any other way than after a sacramental mode; or that the body of Christ lies hid corporeally under the bread; or that under the form of bread he ought to be worshipped; and that he who receives the signs also receives the things signified. The body of Christ is in heaven, at the right hand of the father; the hearts must be elevated on high toward heaven, and not cleave to the bread; and the Lord is not to be worshipped in the bread Mark 16: 19. Heb. 8: 1-12, 2. And yet He, the Lord, is not absent from His congregation which celebrates the sacrament. The sun, however far from us it may be in the heavens, is not the less effectually near. How much more Christ, the sun of righteousness, separated from us in heaven, according to the body, is with us, not corporeally, but spiritually through His life-giving power, and as He himself promised in His last supper to be with us. John 14: 18. Matt. 28: 20.

From this it follows that we do not have a supper without Christ, but we have an unbloody and mystical supper, as the whole of the ancient church denominated it.

Moreover, in the celebration of the holy supper we are admonished to be mindful of the body of which we have become members, to be at concord with all the brethren; that we must live holy lives, and not stain ourselves with vices and idolatry, but persevere in the true faith unto the end of life, giving diligence to excel in the sanctification of our walk and conversation. 1 Cor. 10: 17; 12: 12, 13. Hence it is proper that before the supper we should examine ourselves, according to the commandment of

the apostle ; and especially as to our faith. Whether we believe that Christ is come to save sinners, and to call to *repentance* ; and whether each one believes that he belongs to the number of those who are redeemed and saved through Christ ; and whether he have the firm purpose to change his perverted life and to live in holiness, and with the help of the Lord to persevere in the true religion and the unity with the brethren, and to bring forth due thanksgiving to God for his redemption. 1 Cor. 11: 28. 2 Cor. 13: 15.

With respect to the mode or form of the supper, we hold that to be the simplest and best which comes nearest to the first institutions of the Lord and to the Apostles' doctrine. It consists in proclaiming the Word of God, in pious prayers, the prayer of the Lord ; in the eating and drinking of the body and blood of the Lord for a remembrance of His salvation, bringing death, in believing thanksgiving ; and then also in a sacred meeting for churchly communion. Acts 2: 42.

We therefore condemn those who refuse to believers one part of the sacrament, namely, the cup of the Lord. For they sin grievously against the institution of the Lord who says (Matt. 26: 27), "Drink ye all of it," which in the case of the bread He did not so expressly say. Whether the Mass, as it was used in ancient times, is to be tolerated or not, of this we will not now dispute. But this we say freely, that the Mass which at the present day is in use in the whole Romish church, is abolished in our churches ; and this for many and most just grounds, which we will not here enumerate singly, for the sake of brevity. It has been impossible for us to approve that an empty spectacle should be made out of this sacred transaction. Yea, that it has been degraded to a means of gain, and is celebrated for money ; so that it is said : the priest makes the body of the Lord, and offers the same essentially for the remission of sins of the living and the dead ; that it is administered in honor and celebration or in memory of the saints in heaven, &c.

#### *Of Sacred and Ecclesiastical Meetings.*

Although it is lawful for all to read the Holy Scriptures for themselves at home, and by mutual instruction to edify one another in the true religion, yet sacred and churchly assemblings are altogether necessary for believers, in order that the word of

the Lord may be rightly proclaimed to the people, that public prayers and supplications may be made, that the holy sacraments may be properly celebrated, and that collections may be made for the poor and the needy of the church.

It is well known that in the Apostolic and early churches, these meetings were carefully attended by all believers. Those who despise them, and separate themselves from them, these condemn the true religion, and ought to be pressingly urged by the pastors and pious magistrates, not to continue stubbornly to separate themselves and to forsake the sacred meetings.

But these assemblings of the congregation are not to be secret or concealed, but public and numerously attended, unless the persecutions of the enemies of Christ and His church will not suffer them to be public. For we know how formerly, under the tyranny of the Roman Emperors, in the primitive church, the meetings were held in secret places.

But the places where believers assemble ought to be decent and in all things fit for a congregation of God. Let commodious houses or temples be chosen; but let them be purged of all things that do not beseem the church. Let care be taken in all things in respect to appropriateness, necessity and godly decency; let nothing be wanting that is necessary for the rites and churchly customs.

And as we believe that God does not dwell in temples made with hands, so we also know that the places devoted to God and his worship, are not profane, but holy, on account of the word of God and the holy exercises, and that those who are assembled in them ought to behave themselves reverently and modestly, as though they were in a sacred place, in the presence of God and the holy angels. Thence there must be kept away from all Christian churches and pulpits, all excess of vestments, all pride, and everything that does not beseem humility, discipline, and Christian modesty.

*For the true ornament of Christian churches does not consist in ivory, gold and pearls, but in the simplicity, piety and virtues of those who are therein.* 1st Kings 8: 27; Acts 17: 24.

Let all things be done decently and orderly in the church (1 Cor. 14: 26;) and unto edification (v. 40). Therefore, no foreign language in the sacred meeting: let all things be uttered in the common tongue of the place, so that all may understand: 1 Cor. 14: 27, 40.



*Of the Prayers of the Church, of Singing, and of the Canonical Hours.*

Although it be true that a man may pray in any tongue that he understands, yet the public prayers in sacred meeting should be made in the language known to all.

Every prayer of the believer shall be directed to God alone, in faith and love, through the only mediator, Christ. To invoke the saints in heaven, or to seek their intercession, denies the high-priesthood of Christ the Lord and the true fear of God. Prayer, however, must be made for those in authority, for the kings and all magistrates, for the ministers and all necessities of the church. In times of distress, especially those of the church, prayers are to be made without ceasing, privately and in public, but freely, not constrained, nor for any reward. Nor is it seemly that prayer should be tied superstitiously to any place, as though it were not allowed us to pray any where else than in the temple.

Nor is it necessary that the public prayers, in respect to form and time, should be alike in all churches. Every church may, in this respect, make use of its own liberty. *Socrates* says, in his history, "In any country or nation you will not find two churches, which in prayer, have entirely the same form." I hold that the ground of this diversity is to be found in those who in different ages had the government of the churches. But, wherein they agree, it is much to be commended and worthy to be imitated by others. Ps. 50: 15. James 1: 5. John 14: 13, 14. 1 Tim. 2: 5. Matt. 11: 24.

But as in all other things, so it is proper that in public prayers there should be a mean that they be not over long and tiresome.

The chief part of the meeting must be devoted to the holy doctrine of the gospel, and the people must not be wearied by long prayers, so that when the sermon commences, the tired ones will wish, either to forsake the meeting, or to see it brought to a close. For to such the sermons seem to be over long, which, otherwise, are short enough. Yea, the preachers also must keep a mean. So, likewise, the singing in the sacred meetings, where it is in use, should be moderated. The so-called Gregorian singing has much in it that is inappropriate, and, therefore, it has been properly rejected of ours and many other churches.

If there are churches which have the right and believing preaching of the gospel, but no singing by the side theory, they are not

to be condemned: for not all congregations have the skill of singing. From the testimony of antiquity we learn, that as singing was in use early in the churches of the East, so it was only later that it was received in the Western churches.

The so-called Canonical Hours, that is, prayers prescribed for certain hours of the day and sung or chanted by the Papists, were not known to the primitive church; this can be proven by many of these prayers and other arguments. But they contain also many absurd things (to mention only this). And, therefore, they are properly omitted by congregations who in their stead have brought in matters more wholesome for the whole church of God.

J. H. G.

#### A NEGRO SERMON IN FLORIDA.

MR. WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT writes from Florida: A lady, the other day, gave me an account of a sermon which she heard not long since in St. Augustine, as an example of their (the Florida negroes) mode of embellishing history. The preacher had dwelt awhile on the fall of man and the act of disobedience by which sin came into the world, and had got as far as the time of Noah. He then said:

"De world got to be berry wicked; de people all bad, and de Lord make up His mind to drown dem. Bût Noah was a good man, who read his Bible, and did as de Lord tole him. And de Lord tole Noah to build a big ark, big enough to hold part of ebery living ting alive on de earth. And Noah built it. And de Lord call upon ebery living ting to come into de ark and be saved. And de birds come flyin' to de ark, and de big lion and de cow and de possum come in, and de horse come trottin' to de ark, and de leetle worms come creepin' in; but only de wicked sinner wouldn't come in, and dey laugh at Noah and his big ark. And den de rain come down, but Noah he set comfortable and dry in de ark and read his Bible. And de rain come down in big spouts, and come up to de doo' step of de houses and 'gin to cober de floo', and den de sinner he scart and knock at de doo' ob de ark berry hard. And de big lion hear de racket and roar, and de dog bark, and de ox bellow, but Noah keep on reading de Bible. And de sinner say, 'Noah, Noah, let us come in.' And Noah say, 'I berry sorry, but I can't let you in, for de Lord has locked de doo' and trow away de key.'"

## **Ursinus College Repertory.**

### THE CERTAINTY OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH.

*Sketch of a Baccalaureate Sermon, Preached to the Senior Class  
and Students of Ursinus College, in St. Luke's  
Reformed Church, Trappe, Pa.,  
June 22, 1873.*

2 Peter 1: 19. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place."

A CHRISTIAN school is gathered to-night, not in its halls of science, but in the house of God. Teachers and learners, we turn from our rooms of recitation to the place of common praise and prayer, and of instruction from those "lively oracles" of heavenly truth which continue to utter their clear and certain lessons whilst the oracle of old Egypt still moulders beneath Libyan sands, and that of Delphi remains dumb. In its most earnest hours the college takes refuge in the church, and students join the throng of worshipers, that the last Sabbath evening of the academic year may be spent together at the throne of grace, and around the feet of Him whose counsels furnish young and old the purest guide of life.

Beside the general solemnity and interest of this hour and place, it receives special significance from the fact that, with regard to some of you, we meet to-night as we shall never meet here again. Their academic race is nearly run; and as it is about to close, we assemble to dismiss them with words of encouragement and admonition, and to make the season of parting blessed with the associations of the sanctuary.

From the many appropriate themes suggested by the occasion, viewed as all such occasions should be—in the light of the gospel—I select one which my reasonable concern for young men summoned forth to enter upon the more active duties of life, and in



these times strongly prompts me to choose—one also which I rejoice to find so plainly presented by the Word of God. It is THE INDUBITABLE CERTAINTY OF CHRISTIAN TRUTH. Of all the equipments which the young men of our day need for the warfare for which they are drafted, one of the first is a moral certainty of the truth, by which, in its deepest sense, they must be inwardly strengthened and sustained, and for which they are to labor and contend.

I. But *is there any real need of such a personal certainty of truth?* Whilst it may be allowed to be gratifying to our feelings, or our reason, to have the confident assurance of intelligent conviction, in regard to whatever we may be taught or led to accept as truth, is such assured conviction as important and desirable, as is often asserted?

1. To this inquiry some give a *negative reply*. Indeed, it is denied by all who elevate ecclesiastical and sacerdotal authority in matters of religious knowledge and faith above the direct and sole supremacy of the Scriptures. Their partisan interests, it may be said, leads them to give this negative answer. But without impugning motives, or tracing their avowed theory to an evil source, it may be admitted, in charity, that they honestly believe that it is best for men to forego the exercise of individual reason or rationally wrought conviction, in matters of religious faith, and unquestioningly accept the dogmas prepared for them and recommended by the church, or rather by those in the church, who claim a divinely ordained prerogative to teach men what they must believe. As this theory necessarily, and logically, too, on its own false premises, denies the right or propriety of disputing the claim thus set up, there is an end of arguing the case with it.

2. But leaving those who hold this view to their own exclusive claim, to its contradictions of history, and its hurtful consequences, many strong and, we think, incontrovertible reasons demand an unequivocal *affirmative answer* to the above questions. Those reasons may be comprehended under two general ones.

(1.) First, *our intellectual constitution* demands it. In that constitution, man is what he is, as to the original laws of his intellectual being, by an ordinance and arrangement as truly divine as any that can be claimed for sacerdotal domination in matters of faith. The laws of the human mind are divine laws. Man thinks, acquires knowledge, becomes convinced of truth, when

he acts in accordance with his mental constitution, because God would have him so think, so acquire knowledge, and so become convinced of truth. And when he acts in obedience to those laws, he is not arrogating an unlawful measure of primate judgment. For such a being as man is, rationally, there can be but one way of attaining a full and proper conviction of truth. He must *know what the truth is*, and *have sufficient ground for accepting it as such*. Without this he may be credulous, but he cannot have faith; he may be superstitious, but he cannot be truly pious. It is his duty to use his reason in matters which appeal to the inner life, as much as it is his duty to use his natural senses in regard to objects in the outer world. He *cannot* make a full and genuine surrender of his soul's convictions to the demands of mere earthly authority, any more than he can see a beetle in an elephant, or a star in a frog, because some one may command him to do so, or try to play on his credulity.

But man, as God has made him, is not animated only with aspirations after knowledge; those aspirations, in normal exercise, are also after *true* and *right* knowledge, and an inward assurance of its being right and true. Stronger than instinct is the desire of honest reason to know correctly and with well-grounded confidence, whatever may be offered to knowledge. No heart ever panted after the water-brook as the upright human spirit pants after the truth. Not only does it cry out against delusion, and beg not to be deceived, but would feel itself resting, in regard to all it holds for truth, upon a foundation of rock. You have heard its joyful shout, Eureka! when that foundation was believed to have been found, even in regard to natural truth. Better still, you have heard it sing to the psaltery and the harp, its devout Te Deum, when it could say with exulting gratitude, My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed.

The mind, as God made it, is restive under doubt and uncertainties regarding temporal facts and truths; it is wretched, and, like the troubled sea, devoid of peace, when such uncertainty and doubts concern eternal facts and truths.

Only consider what men devoted to earthly science have done, from the days of the ancient astrologers and the time when the greatest philosopher of his age wrote of nature's products, from the hyssop on the wall to the cedar of Lebanon, in order to achieve a certain knowledge of the things which engaged their study. What delv-

ings in geology, what vigils in astronomy, what fasting and toils have marked, and still mark, the labors of men of science. And all to discover a *certain* knowledge of things. Old and favorite theories, discovered to be false, have been cast off as contemned rags, and new theories have been reluctantly embraced under this mighty mental impulse.

Exceptions there are and have been. Scientists have ever arisen who, like moles and bats, have preferred darkness to light, and labored to fortify themselves in error. But such have, happily, been rare exceptions, and do not disprove our point.

It may be said, indeed, that man's reason has become perverted through sin, and that through this sad fact he is incapacitated for its free and full exercise. No one denies this, or the legitimate inferences from the mournful fact. *But all men—Popes and priests as well—are by nature equally involved in this calamity and its consequences. No set or class can claim exemption from it, unless they come with a properly authenticated message issuing directly from a source which commends itself as infallible, and which really possesses supreme authority to dictate what is to be accepted.* But this is precisely the point for which we are contending. Whoever brings a new doctrine must show his supernatural credentials.

(2.) Man's *moral constitution* corroborates this view. He is responsible for holding what he holds, as truth. He dare not accept any Creed which may be pressed upon him. Endowed with a personal will and conscience, these must be properly exercised in every appeal made to his faith. It is his duty to be convinced for himself, that what he may embrace as truth, is indeed such. This responsibility cannot be shifted upon others. To say or think—I leave others to tell me what I must believe; if they lead me astray, the fault is theirs, not mine—is treason to personal responsibility. Before any one can do this, he must either have sunk into the despair of skepticism, and try to escape by betaking himself to this false refuge, or he must have voluntarily debased himself, ethically and mentally, in regard to matters of religious knowledge and faith, by blunting all his moral sensibilities.

In this view, then, we hold and maintain that every one is bound morally to know the certainty of truth. Hence, the need of a sure ground of such certainty.

II. How fully these views of the case accord with the *Holy*



*Scriptures*, is shown by the earnest and positive manner in which they enjoin the duty of attaining to such inward assurance of the truth, and condemn the spirit of doubting and unbelief.

1. They assume throughout that every one *may* attain to this moral and intellectual certainty, even under existing circumstances. They take it for granted that all will desire to do so. Man's obligations in this respect are held to lay him under a most solemn responsibility to avail himself of all the means he possesses, or may have within his reach, in order to make sure of so great a blessing. The law and the prophets, psalmists and seers, abound in commands and exhortations to this effect. Almost the entire book of Proverbs, as well as Ecclesiastes, is occupied with divine counsels and precepts bearing upon this point. God raised up and inspired messengers, burdened with special injunctions upon those to whom they were sent, challenging them to give heed to the instructions of the Lord, that they might know and understand what He revealed to them. Appeals are made to them, based upon the authority of God as their King, upon His parental claims as their Father, and upon their own highest interests for time and eternity, urging upon them the duty of preferring the assured knowledge of truth above all the gold and silver and most precious gems of earth. And when the Lord of the holy prophets Himself appeared, with what solemn tenderness does He invite those who may have grown faint and despondent under the pressure of doubts and misgivings, to come and learn of Him the certain way of securing this rest for their souls!

2. With equal earnestness, and in even more solemn manner, do these same Scriptures reprove and condemn all who willfully neglect the means of attaining to such settled and well-grounded convictions. "Woe to them that have eyes and will not see, that have ears and will not hear." "Ye will not come to Me, that ye may have light." They are held guilty of bringing darkness and destruction upon themselves, and are fearfully threatened with final abandonment to the merited penalty of their own perverseness and folly.

III. Closely connected with the argument furnished for our doctrine by such divine injunctions and threatenings, and still more strongly corroborative of its correctness, is the fact that the most *ample and adequate provision has been made to supply man's need, and to enable him to meet his obligations in regard to this vital mat-*

*ter.* In this provision every condition demanded by the exigencies of man as fallen, blind, prone to err, liable to the self-delusion of a darkened understanding and a naturally corrupt heart, is fully met.

Only consider what God has mercifully done to furnish us with a sure and all-sufficient ground of faith.

1. *He has revealed the truth*, by means and instrumentalities abundantly authenticated as divinely commissioned and inspired, for the very purpose of teaching man what he needed certainly to know. In other words, to make sure of having us taught with infallible accuracy the things essential to our proper enlightenment, God Himself condescended to become our teacher. From His own mouth has the word of truth proceeded, and in the very words of His own choosing, as best suited to declare it. We have it on no human peradventure, through no fortunate discovery of human study, as the utterance of no human ecstasy, however elevated or devout. In the most real and literal sense, it comes to us directly from God Himself. This holds of all that was revealed under the Old Testament dispensation. It holds in even a larger and more literal sense of the still clearer revelation granted in the New Testament. Sure as the ancient word of prophecy was, its elucidation by the wonderful fulfillment of all previous predictions in Jesus Christ, and especially by light which shone forth from Him as the sun of righteousness, the light of the world, the true light which lighteth every one willing to receive Him, made the prophecy of earlier ages still more sure. Now no one need walk in darkness, but, following Christ (the Christ of the gospel; that is, not the Christ of a vain human philosophy), may have the light of life.

2. For not only has God spoken to men to receive to them a certain ground of truth, but He has done so in words and terms so clear and simple, and unambiguous, that all may understand. In the Gospel emphatically has the mystery hidden from man for ages, through his own perverse blindness, been made known, and so made known that all the children of God in Jesus Christ may apprehend it. The revelation was made to be understood. He who taught man how to speak, surely knew how to speak to man, so that the most untutored wayfarer might unerringly catch the meaning of His words. More clearly than any declarations of councils of mitred bishops, or the dogmas of erudite doctors;

more intelligibly than any papal allocutions of men daring to claim infallibility, has God told men what they must believe, and how they ought to live. No Pontiff, arrogating ghostly supremacy over the heritage of the Lord ; no Wiseman, employing the arts of Jesuit sophistry in order to delude men into servile submission to that supremacy ; no Pusey, deceitfully pretending to be loyal to a cause he is basely betraying, nor any of their open or disguised abettors, must be allowed to shake our confidence in this most comforting fact, or defraud us of the peace of mind and heart which it alone can give.

3. The more certainly to secure man in the possession of this surer word of prophecy, as an indubitable ground of truth, *the supernatural revelation thus made has been preserved, by divine love, in a permanent and fully authenticated record of it, in the Bible*—that Bible which is the plague of the papacy, and a stone of stumbling to all hierarchical sacerdotalists—but which, in Him whom it proclaims as the Redeemer of the lost, is a light shining in a dark place to them who have been led to look unto Him for their salvation.

4. And to insure His merciful purpose in thus providing for man's need of such a divine foundation of truth, there is the additional gift of the Holy Spirit, as the Paraclete promised by Jesus to His people, by whose direct influences on their minds and hearts, they should be "*led into all truth.*" This promise is not the exclusive inheritance of chosen, or self-appointed officials, but is graciously pledged to every sincere believer.

Could there be ampler means ? Could there be more satisfactory provision ? Could man want or ask for more, to enable him to attain to that certainty of truth which his mental and moral nature demand, and which God requires him to secure ? For the enlightenment of his truth is made known to him. To secure him against error, and to fortify him against the disturbing influence of fears lest he may be deceived, that truth is revealed, proclaimed, by God Himself, the fountain of truth. To preserve that revelation in its purity, and guard it against possible perversions and serious mistakes, by merely committing it to the devious stream of oral tradition, it is put on record. To bring it within the easy reach of a plain and honest reason or understanding, all is made known in familiar and simple language, figures of speech borrowed from well-known facts of nature and social life. And to compensate



for man's dullness and slowness to learn higher, divine truth, through the warping and stupefying effect of sin, as well to supply an ever-present, and omniscient, infallible interpreter and teacher, that Holy Spirit concerning whom our Lord so encouragingly says: "If ye being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him."

Surely, then, we have good reason for asserting the doctrine of this discourse. On the contrary, those who, under whatever impulse or state of mind, teach and maintain views calculated not only to disturb confidence in the leading tenets of our prevailing Evangelical faith, but the confidence of men in regard to a certain ground of truth in general, are not only acting an unwise part, but are arraying themselves against the plainest demands of reason, and the most positive claims of revealed religion. They may boast of being apostles, in an eminent sense, of the Gospel of the supernatural, but just when the divinely supernatural comes nearest to man to help him out of dreary darkness into a heavenly day, they do, perhaps unwittingly, what seems to bring it into discredit.

Young gentlemen, brethren, about soon to pass from our more immediate tuition, and to enter upon the more earnest, active duties of life, the times have pressed the theme we have been considering upon you. Though you may no longer claim our official care, you cannot break away from our Christian solicitude. My brother instructors, with myself, will follow you with tender concern and constant prayers for your future safety and success. But our anxieties for you are greatly relieved by the conviction, that you are not thrust out upon a dark and stormy sea without chart, or compass, or a guiding star. You are supplied with all the helps you need, for a safe and prosperous voyage, and we trust that those helps are so securely lodged in your hearts by grace, that you will never lose them.

Perils, I know, must be encountered. But they are no greater than those which in the past have been overcome a thousand times. Evil days may be at hand. But they cannot be worse than those through which tens of thousands of faithful sons of God, in Christ, have passed triumphantly. Error may toil with renewed vigor, and most insidious subtlety, to sap the foundations of our apostolic faith. But error has blunted its sharpest tools and crushed its

most brazen brow so often against the adamantine rock of those foundations, that you need not be unduly alarmed. Schools that should be towers of strength for Gospel truth, may open their gates to the enemy, and afford a place of shelter, and protected assault, to the worst foes of that truth. But similar treasons have marred the sacred history of the past, and have also proven that all such machinations ultimately fail, or recoil upon those who employ them.

Be not afraid. The weapons of God's armory have been proven in many a conflict. His helmet of salvation will protect your head. His breastplate of righteousness and shield of faith will securely cover your heart. Your feet, shod with the preparation of His Gospel of peace, you will safely pass through the waters of the Red sea or the burning sands of the Desert. And that surer word of prophecy which is put into your hands, will be found to be the word of the Spirit, by which you may both defend yourselves and slay even giant's errors which may meet you in your path, and seek to drive you back in captivity to their power.

Only go forth, "strong in the Lord, and in the Word of His might." Fight, in this confidence, the good fight of faith. In the full assurance of truth, run with patience the race that is before you. Let no man rob or defraud you of that assurance. Suffer no science, falsely so-called, no vain philosophy of men, no tortuous theology, as shallow as it is muddy, to mislead or trouble you. Then, when the season of earthly conflict is over, you will not only come off more than conquerors yourselves, but will have been instrumental in the Lord's hands of leading others to victory.

Giving constant heed to that surer word of prophecy which offers to be a halo-cloud to guide you by day, and a light, like a pillar of fire, shining upon your course amidst the darkness of night, you will be kept from falling, until there dawns upon you the brightness of that eternal day whose light is the Lamb raised from the ignominy of the cross to the throne of divine glory in the highest heavens; unto whom, with the Father and the Spirit, be all honor and thanksgiving forever.

---

MR. HEPWORTH'S church, New York city, has been dedicated. Its cost was \$255,000. Mr. H. has formally united with the Congregationalists.

## A SALUTATORY ORATION—THE LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE.

BY F. F. BAHNER.

It is with emotions of mingled joy and sadness, or, as Homer would be likely to express it, smiling tearfully, that the class of '73 appears on the stage this morning to celebrate the first Commencement, properly so called, of Ursinus College. Commencements, in the history of colleges, being the crowning act, so to speak, of a prescribed course of study protracted through several successive years, are generally occasions of more than ordinary interest for the institutions under whose supervision they are held, and especially to those who may be more immediately and actively interested in them. Above all, however, may this be presumed to be the case with regard to our Commencement to-day.

This event has been anticipated with pleasurable anxiety. And yet there have not been wanting at the same time ominous feelings, lest perchance our first Commencement should not meet our expectations regarding it. Whatever our anticipations may have been, however, we are glad to know, and to be able to say, that seeing so large and intelligent an audience here this morning, we feel that they are more than realized. For us this occasion is naturally fraught with much interest, and your attendance upon these exercises will add not a little to the perpetuation of the pleasant reminiscences of our College days, and form a bright epoch in the history of our lives, to which memory will often revert in future years. In this view we heartily welcome you all to our Commencement festivities.

All welcome, we repeat, to our Commencement. But they say we graduate to-day, by which some would fain understand that having passed through a College curriculum of study we have really perfected ourselves in the different branches taught, and have so far extended the boundaries of our knowledge that there remains for us little more to be learned. This suggests the limits of knowledge, as a theme which may appropriately engage attention for a few minutes to-day.

The course of study which we have been pursuing, and which embraces the different branches usually taught in similar institutions, covers but a small portion of the vast field of knowledge.



No single science taught has attained the highest degree of perfection of which it is capable, and to which it may be presumed it will attain in time to come. The study of languages, for instance, cannot be supposed to have thrown all the light possible on the obscure and forgotten past; and it is altogether probable that the study of philology will yet be cultivated to a greater extent, and be carried to a higher degree of perfection than it has hitherto attained. Mathematics, too, has by no means been exhausted. We do not fully comprehend the mystic power of numbers, and for aught we know, they may yet disclose truths more stupendous than the sublime discoveries of Newton or La Place. Then, again, we have not even entered the vestibule of the majestic temple of Natural Science, reared by the hand of God. On the contrary, we have caught but a faint glimpse of the glories that gleam through all the wondrous works of nature around us. Nor will a reflecting mind be perplexed by the fact, that the powers of the human intellect should be thus circumscribed and limited. Rather should we expect this to be so from the nature of the case. Omniscience is an attribute of Deity, and consequently there is no limit to that which God may know. Man, however, has been placed by his Creator in a universe which, compared with Himself, may be considered infinite; and, although endowed with a mind that is capable of indefinite expansion and progression, it is not supposable that he will ever exhaust those mysteries which in countless numbers lie hidden in the works of God. One of man's first duties is to know himself; and yet with all his boasted powers, God-like intellect and far-reaching grasp of thought, he has never been able to comprehend the mystery of his own wonderful being. Since the day Almighty-creative power first breathed into Adam the breath of life and he became a living soul, man has labored in vain to unravel the mystery of that vital principle which pervades his physical organism, and which we call life. He knows comparatively little of what he is, but of how he exists he has not the slightest conception. Life, as to its ultimate nature, or first principle, eludes his most diligent research, so that the investigations of the profoundest philosophers on this point has always ended in disappointment. If now turning in upon himself, man fails to fathom the mystery of his own being, and to comprehend the enigma of the little world within him, how much less can he be expected, with his puny mind, to span the immensity of Cosmos,

to grasp the wondrous universe, stretching far away in light and glory upon every side. The truth is, that to a clear and adequate conception of any one thing, an infinity of knowledge is requisite. This, doubtless, arises from the fact that nothing is isolated, but a chain of mutual dependencies runs through all history; every fact bears a relation to every other fact; and every truth, however insignificant, throws light upon every other truth, however vast. And it is because the infinite mind of God alone can comprehend these complicated relations—see things as they really exist—and know the end of all from the beginning, that He is said to be infinite in knowledge.

Man's knowledge, on the contrary, is relative, and therefore bounded. Holding his present existence in the categories of time and space, his capacity for knowledge is necessarily circumscribed and restricted. Capable of indefinite expansion, there is yet a point beyond which the human mind can never pass. Especially does this hold with regard to the deep things of God, and the verities of eternity. Hence it is that so many persons thinking themselves wise have become fools in attempting to fathom the depths of the ways and wisdom of God, and in striving to comprehend those spiritual doctrines which are the proper objects of faith. All this, however, should form no ground of discouragement in our pursuit of knowledge. On the contrary, the thought that there lies before us a sphere in which the mind can expatiate forever, should incite us with greater zeal in extending the boundaries of our knowledge. For above the loftiest heights to which the human intellect has ever soared, there are others yet to be penetrated. And beyond the widest range of intellectual vision there lie worlds yet to be explored by the bold adventurer of this and succeeding ages. Whatever, therefore, may be the joy and mutual congratulations of the day which closes our academic career, instead of exulting over it as a triumphant conclusion to literary toils, we rather hail it as a new starting point for future efforts in the same high course. Our race is not ended. Rather does it now first most really begin. Let this be Commencement day, then, in the true sense of a fresh beginning, that with new zest and energy we may enter upon another and a longer curriculum of study. Let it be the commencement of a life of usefulness in the achievement of results worthy of the advantages which have been here enjoyed; worthy of those to whose faithful and patient tuition

we are largely indebted for what has been acquired ; and above all, worthy of Him who has made us capable of such great attainments, and placed us in a sphere boundlessly commensurate with the capacities with which we are endowed.

---

LITERARY CRITICISM—VALEDICTORY ORATION.

BY H. T. SPANGLER.

WITHIN the present century a new department of literature has come into existence. We have series of essays and entire volumes occupied with critiques on great authors or some of their writings. Our libraries are furnished with many books which consist of criticisms and interpretations of single authors, and even of single works. Opposing theories have arrayed those engaged in this new literary sphere, in open conflict. Indeed, these controversies have become so active, and men of letters have so generally devoted themselves to the elucidation of the works of their predecessors and contemporaries, that it almost seems as if this was the age of nothing but criticism. It is certain there now exists such a department of literature ; and that it has enlisted the services of many of the ablest scholars, some of whom have not only been distinguished as critics, but have been known as the foremost writers of their own generation.

This new phase of literature is of German origin. It is the outgrowth of extensive reading, the child and handmaid of reflection, and therefore it was natural that it should first have taken form in Germany. It is of comparatively recent development ; for there must first be brought into being a considerable number of productions before the critic's materials are prepared. Although for several ages past there were liberal-minded scholars, who took critical estimates of the great writers who had gone before them, yet as it now exists, with distinctly recognized functions and fixed principles and laws for its direction, it is a monument of the present century. Formerly it concerned itself almost exclusively with the form of literature ; now, while it does not neglect the form, it thinks more of the matter, the truth and weightiness of the thoughts, the nobleness of the sentiments, the elegance and



splendor of the imagery, and the heroism and refinement of the author as expressed in his works. Formerly the critic was regarded as the natural enemy of the author; now he is required to be the expounder of his thoughts and feelings.

Criticism demands an enlarged and profound conception of literature itself. The word is not restricted to those works whose prime object is to address the imagination or to please the taste; which are attractive from perfection of style or beauty of imagery. While it is required that a work which aspires to be called 'a work of literature' should have a certain finish of style and form, none are excluded on account of solidity or earnestness. From the loftiest flights of fiction and poetry to the prosiest analysis of the scientific essay, if excellent in style and method, all are embraced within the comprehensive limits of literature. With this extensive field, any one who would set himself up as a critic must be familiar, in order that he may make a true estimate of the abilities and merits of a writer; that he may not judge him by the mere accidents of form and according to the caprices of a changing taste, but may study and test him according to the perfect ideal of literary excellence. He must learn the personal, local, and temporary influences that help so powerfully to direct and mould the activeness of life, as well as the form and pressure of the author's time, which are generally reflected in his writings, in order that he may not criticise from a purely abstract point of view. The really elevated and large-minded critic seeks to explain and justify whatever is excellent; to expose and reject whatever is defective or bad. In respect to style, he seeks for the permanent characteristics of good writing in the peculiarities of the individual; in thought, he measures each writer by the circumstances and intelligence of his people, and his time, by the aims he has in view, and the capacity and attainments he may have manifested. In a word, he judges the good of each by the individuality of the author, by his aims, his audience, the time and language of his writings, and the people whose genius inspires him. The philosophic critic, also, in the best sense of the term, interprets the author. He aids the reader to penetrate the significance of bold deeds and passionate words, and to fill out what the writer has only suggested. Thus the greatest gifts of genius can be severely tasked and worthily employed in this service of interpretation; and, when successfully performed, invests the author with mani-

fold greater attractions to the reader, whom it binds to the interpreter by heavy obligations.

To be a critic, therefore, in the truest sense of the word, requires a genius equal to that of the greatest writer, and years of research in the vast domain of literature. Practically, however, this standard is not attained, as is abundantly proved by the critical essays and reviews which flood the land, from the pens of inferior scholars and editors. In this age of universal criticism, the vigorous growth of a healthy and elevated literature is stunted by the contributions of censorious literati, who aim rather at impairing the esteem of the people for an author, than at conforming his claims to fame and admiration.

This efficient purifying and invigorating agent of the literary world is often made the vehicle of private prejudice and envy by partizans who dare not meet their opponents in open contest. Under the pretence of informing the reading public of the real merit of a writer, they endeavor to call forth odium and reproach on one whose superiority they feel, by adroitly neglecting to notice his excellences, but skillfully magnifying his defects. That such criticism exerts an injurious influence on literature, needs no demonstration.

It is only by seeking fairly and fully to understand an author so as to be enabled to enter into his feelings and to catch his spirit, by giving ourselves up to his influence so that we seem to create with him, by being so completely in sympathy with him as to feel like his other self, that we are enabled to feel a generous and intelligent delight in the beauties revealed by criticism. When thus applied, it teaches us to look for excellences rather than to search for defects, and when it has taught us to find them, prompts us to their heartiest enjoyment. In this way philosophical criticism is of inestimable service to the generality of readers and to the productions of great intellects. Their lofty aspirations, noble sentiments and riches of thought would be unknown, and not appreciated by a numerous class without its aid. It brings within the reach and capacity of mediocrity the productions of the best minds, and thus prepares the materials for elevating the acquisitions of talented men to the attainments of genius. It unfolds to men of inferior culture the gems of thought and fancy which are buried in the peculiarities of style and in the effusions of a fertile imagination, so that the vast resources of literature which

formerly were only at the command of genius, are now free to all who apply themselves to seek treasures in a field where they are most profusely strown.

To-day the class of '73, of Ursinus College, is celebrating its graduation festivities. Time has swiftly wafted us through the changing scenes of our collegiate course. During a few short years of acquaintance, friendship has been weaving a golden chain around our hearts, and now we are called on to speak the words of separation. Days of labor, days of mirth, and days of gloom have not departed without leaving their witnesses. What we anticipated a few years ago, is now before us in reality. Beautiful day dreams of a youthful imagination have been dissipated by the heat of laborious duties, and our college course is now a fact in each individual history.

We now stand at the door, fellow students, with your hands gently laid in ours, ready to say the last words of feeling. The remaining days of your college career will soon be over, when you will be ushered into the arena of active life. Strive to be faithful in the discharge of your duties, for by so doing you will find great reward.

Gentlemen of the Board of Trustees, we desire especially to thank you for the advantages we enjoyed through your incessant labors in behalf of Evangelical Christian education. You have reared, under the care of a corps of professors to whose worth and faithfulness we are proud to testify, an institution of learning which is free from the taints of a false philosophy, a debauched science, and an unsound religion. To-day we present to you the first fruits of its labors, which we trust may merit your approbation, and incite you to a more liberal support and encouragement of the cause you espoused in the consecration of this college to the service of a pure Christianity.

To you, respected Faculty, we owe our deepest obligations for the conscientious faithfulness with which you have watched over us and instructed us while in your care; for the discipline you have given our minds, and the fountains of knowledge to which you have led us. Be assured, that we shall ever cherish the kindest feelings toward our Alma Mater, and shall neglect no opportunity to show to the world that here we found a Christian home and a seat of learning, in whose academic shades literature loves to linger. To you, we say farewell.

Classmates, our words to you are few, for the language of the



heart cannot be conveyed in words. The time we enjoyed each other's intercourse has closed. What a pleasure to realize that no angry feelings or harsh words have disturbed the peace and harmony of our social relations. We have labored together with such perfect concord and vied with each other so generously, that to bid you adieu is severing bonds of friendship cemented with kind words and kind deeds. Let us strive to acquit ourselves as men, in the contest of life, ever laboring, ever believing, ever hoping in God as our strength and our shield. To you, also, we say farewell.

Friends, who have gathered to witness our closing festivities, the work of the class of '73 is finished. To you all, farewell.

H. T. S.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

For the present number these items turn around one bright central point, the festivities of the Commencement week. It was an eventful week, anticipated with high expectations and realizing the fondest hopes of all who felt an interest in it, either as members of the College, or as visiting friends and patrons who came from far and near to participate in our first annual Preisvertheilungsfeierlichkeit, as Hegel, with logical terseness, calls such days.

*The Commencement as seen from within, through College eyes.*

To the inmates of the Institution, as those more responsibly interested in the event, the occasion naturally wore an aspect tinged and shaded by their peculiar position. In them expectation mingled with some anxiety, and their desires that all would pass off creditably and pleasantly, were chastened with some modest fears. Would friends at a distance feel sufficient interest in young Ursinus to be attracted by his first full anniversary? Would the community around have, and display sufficient sympathy, with his earliest effort, to leave their secular toils and gather to his festive halls? Would the day be fair, and nature smile propitiously upon the occasion? Would each more active participator in the appointed exercises of the day succeed in his part? And would the general effect and the more permanent results be favorable?

These, and similar queries, indicate the inner light in which such an occasion is commonly viewed by the College household. And it is gratifying to be able to say, that in this regard the day, and all connected with it, was all that our fondest hopes anticipated. Friends, in large numbers, flocked in from every point of the compass; some coming nearly two hundred miles for the sole purpose of cheering the College by their presence, and of satisfying themselves by what they might see and hear. Among these was one of the oldest and most esteemed ministerial brethren, whose intelligent and earnest zeal for the cause and principles which the Institution represents, made him superior to bodily infirmity, and brought him from his distant home to Freeland. Seven of the largest Classes, and the two Eastern Synods of the church, were represented at the Commencement, and that by brethren, ministers and laymen, who are among the most active and devoted of the members of the church. The rural village, of but a few score inhabitants, became well-nigh a populous city, and the College buildings, with its campus, were crowded with such as had come not only to see and hear what might be said and done, but to give assurance by their bright faces and warm congratulations, that they were with us heartily in our important work. For this the College felt sincerely grateful, and by it will be encouraged to go forward with renewed confidence and zeal in its important mission.

The services of the week properly began with the Baccalaureate sermon, on Sunday evening, June 22. It was delivered in St. Luke's Reformed church, Trappe, located about eight town squares from the College. The attendance was large, and the solemnity, it is hoped, profitable. By request of the graduating class,\* a full sketch of our sermon (all that could be furnished,) is published in our present number.

Next came, on Wednesday evening, the Biennial address before the Literary Societies by Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D., of Lebanon,

---

\*URSINUS COLLEGE, June 23, 1873.

*Rev. Dr. Bomberger:*

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the class of '73 it was unanimously resolved, that we tender you our hearty thanks for your able and instructive Baccalaureate sermon, delivered before us last evening, and earnestly request its publication in the *Reformed Church Monthly*.

Yours, sincerely,

CLASS OF '73.

Pa. Though called upon at a late hour to take the place of the Rev. A. Wanner, of York, who was unavoidably prevented from fulfilling his engagement, Dr. Kremer delivered an admirable address upon a most appropriate subject. As he has been requested to furnish a copy of it for publication, we hope to afford our readers the pleasure of perusing it in our August number.

Commencement day, June 26, was ushered in with a bright sky, and an atmosphere purified and cooled by the abundant showers of the previous Tuesday. The exercises opened promptly at 10 a. m., with prayer by the Rev. Daniel Ziegler, D.D., of York, Pa. The five members of our first graduating class were all present, and equipped for duty. Each did his part so well, that nothing seemed to be left for the Faculty and Board of Directors, at least, to desire. F. F. Bahner, of Paxinos, Pa., pronounced the Salutatory, selecting a theme (*The Limits of Human Knowledge*) well suited to his cast of mind, worthily discussed, and impressively presented. J. A. Hunsberger, of Trappe, Pa., followed with an earnestly delivered practical oration upon *Religion*. Next came one of the two philosophical orations, meritoriously assigned, J. A. Foil, of Concord, North Carolina. His subject, *Modern Science*, was treated in a scholarly way, and received with manifest approbation. He was followed by J. A. Strassburger, of Schwenksville, Pa., in the other philosophical oration, in which he discussed the theme: *Show Thyself a Man*, in so pleasant and sprightly a manner, that warm expressions of gratification were elicited.

After Mr. Foil's oration the degrees were conferred, and the exercises of the class concluded with a chaste, happily conceived, and well-pronounced Salutatory, by H. T. Spangler, of Myers-town, Pa. The President of the College closed with a few brief words of thanks to the large and interested audience, and a farewell counsel to the young men whose Academic race was now run.

The honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon the Rev. Daniel Zeigler, of York, Pa., and the Rev. J. H. Klein, of Louisville, Ky.

The visiting friends from a distance were then invited to a collation provided under the management of our excellent steward and his indefatigable wife. About one hundred and twenty-five persons sat down to the several tables, not including the students, and yet there was found to be enough and to spare, and all so well prepared and savory, and so well served, that all not only ate and



were satisfied, but showed that they would not object to have the occasion repeated soon again.

At 2½ p. m., a large number of friends reassembled in the new Chapel Hall, to confer and take action in regard to the best means of most effectively serving and promoting the interests of the College, and the cause it is seeking to maintain. In some respects this Conference was the most important feature of the entire occasion. It must be regarded as the product or offspring of a deep and very general feeling, prevailing in thousands of hearts wherever the actual condition and wants of the church are understood and known, that some thoroughly efficient measures should be devised and employed, for the proper maintenance and perpetuation of the true historical principles and characteristics of our Evangelical Reformed Christianity. This feeling prompted the proposal (made by distant friends) to hold a conference on the subject, in connection with the first Commencement of the College. The happy result of the conference is proven by the following report of its proceedings and action, which has been furnished for publication. We invite special attention to the report, and particularly to the plan of organization adopted, and the method by which it is hoped to secure the important objects proposed. The plan is comprehensive, and yet exceedingly simple, and seems to furnish the very means needed for a successful prosecution of our work.

*Report of the Proceedings of the Conference held in Ursinus College Chapel, on Thursday, June 26, 1873.*

The friends and patrons of this institution met in conference at half-past 2 o'clock P. M., and organized by calling Elder J. V. Lambert, Esq., of Philadelphia, to the chair, and electing Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock, Secretary. The meeting was large and enthusiastic.

Capt. Chas. Denues, Esq., of Lancaster, Pa., was called upon, who, in a brief and stirring speech, presented the object of the meeting, and pointed to the great interests which centered in "Ursinus College."

Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger followed in a happy and forcible speech, calling for concerted and united action in reference to the great work before us.

Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock then offered the following plan of or-

ganization, which, after a spirited and earnest discussion, with some amendments, was adopted, to wit:

*Plan of Organization.*

In order to secure more general and effective cōoperation among the friends of Ursinus College, and of the evangelical Reformed principles upon which said College is founded, and more vigorously to further the vital interests which it represents, a number of friends, after due consultation, adopted the following plan of organization:

*Constitution.*

ART. I. *Name and object.*

Sec. 1. The name of this organization shall be The Ursinus Union of the Reformed Church.

Sec. 2. Its aim and object shall be, by suitable means to maintain and promote the principles and interests of Euangelical Protestant Christianity, on the basis of the historical faith and practice of the Reformed church, and especially in connection with Ursinus College.

ART. II. To secure and accomplish this object the Union shall embrace four departments or branches of operation, to wit:

1. A department of *College aid*, to further the interests of Ursinus College, by providing the pecuniary means needful for its more complete endowment, and to increase its power of usefulness.

2. A department of *Beneficiary Education*, to aid young men of proper character and qualifications in their academic and theological preparation for the ministry in the Reformed church.

3. A department of *Church aid*, to assist feeble congregations in supporting the gospel among them, and to supply destitute fields.

4. A department of *Publication*, to provide and circulate such religious literature as may best *serve the purposes* of the Union.

ART. III. Each of these departments shall be in charge of a Permanent or Standing Committee, to be appointed as provided for below. These committees respectively shall control the appropriation of funds obtained for their departments, not specifically designated by the donors.

ART. IV. All persons in regular standing with the Reformed church, or of good moral character, and in *sympathy* with the evangelical principles of this Union, shall be entitled to membership.

ART. V. The officers of the Union shall be a President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer, to be annually chosen by the Union. Their duties shall be the same as those of corresponding officers in similar organizations.

ART. VI. The officers of the Society and chairmen of the committees of the several departments, shall constitute an Executive Committee, fully empowered to transact all the business of the Union during its intervals of meeting.

ART. VII. The Union shall meet annually at such time and place as the Executive Committee may select, due notice of which shall be given.

ART. VIII. No change shall be made in any article of this Constitution affect-

ing the principles and designs of the Union, but by the consent of all the members present at a meeting duly called for the purpose of proposing such change.

In this interesting discussion Dr. Kremer, Rev. A. B. Shenkle, Elders David Dunn and J. M. Follmer, Capt. Chas. Denues, Dr. E. H. Nevin, Rev. W. Hendrickson, Elder J. H. Pearsol, Rev. A. L. Derr, Revs. Hibshman, J. A. Spangler and others participated. Pending the resolutions, the President, J. V. Lambert, retiring, Elder David Dunn was called to the chair.

On motion, a committee of three was appointed, and authorized to select and appoint permanent committees for the several departments designated in the Constitution. This committee consists of Rev. Dr. Bomberger, Rev. J. B. Shumaker and Elder J. H. Pearsol.

The officers of this organization, and the chairman of each committee aforesaid, are to constitute an Executive Committee, empowered to transact all business deemed necessary during the interval of the meeting of the Union.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year, viz : Dr. F. W. Kremer, President ; Rev. Geo. Wolff, Vice President ; Henry A. Kratz, Esq., Secretary ; Rev. Prof. H. W. Super, Treasurer.

The following persons enrolled their names as members of this Union : Rev. Geo. Wolff, Rev. A. B. Shenkle, Rev. Danl. Ziegler, D.D., Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock, Rev. A. Spangler, Rev. W. H. H. Hibshman, Rev. Henry Seisse, Rev. W. Sorber, Rev. L. H. Derr, Capt. Charles Denues, Esq., J. W. Koons, Levi Balliett, Charles Young, J. M. Follmer, J. H. Pearsol, Rev. E. H. Nevin, D.D., Rev. W. Hendrickson, Nathan Pennypacker, Wm. Brownbach, David Dunn, Rev. M. Rowland, Rev. D. Feete, David R. Buckwalter, Rev. J. B. Shumaker, A. L. Kaub, Rev. H. A. Keyser, Rev. Stephen Schweitzer, Wm. Channing Nevin, Esq., H. W. Kratz, Esq., Rev. Dr. Bomberger, Rev. H. W. Super, John Keiper, Wm. Kochenderfer, Hon. Hiram C. Hoover, Rev. F. S. Lindaman, J. V. Lambert, Wm. Johnston.

[Friends not present at the Conference, who may desire to join the *Union*, will please report their names, by letter, to the permanent Secretary, H. W. Kratz, Esq., Trappe, Montgomery county, Pennsylvania.]

As the chairman of the meeting was at this point compelled to



leave, so as to return home by the evening train, David Dunn, Esq., of Huntingdon, was called to take his place.

After some further remarks by different gentlemen present, all expressive of the liveliest interest in what had been done, and of confidence in the result, the meeting adjourned with prayer.

DAVID DUNN,

W. D. C. RODROCK, *Secretary.*

*Chairman pro tem.*

In the evening an entertainment was given by the President of the College, in honor of the graduating class and visiting friends. Over a hundred guests attended, and after a few hours' pleasant fellowship, and a collation on the lawn attached to the residence of the host, the first Commencement day of Ursinus College closed as delightfully as it had begun.

What others thought of the occasion, and how fully they appreciated it, may be inferred already from the proceedings of the *Conference*, and gathered from their accounts of the day. We have space only for the following spontaneous expression of their sentiments :

WHEREAS, Ursinus College, with its able and efficient Faculty, has so fully realized the expectations of its numerous friends; and,

WHEREAS, The great mission which the College, including its Theological course, is yet destined to accomplish, is now on the sure way to success; and,

WHEREAS, The true idea of education includes the whole man, his physical, moral, intellectual and religious nature, which this Institution is pledged to develop to its highest perfection. Therefore,

*Resolved*, That we, the friends and patrons of Ursinus College, congratulate its eminent President, Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger, who, in the face of a combined and bitter opposition, has with great self-denial and untiring labor, surmounted the many barriers which clogged the infant steps of this Institution in its onward march, and secured for it the admiration and respect of all its friends.

*Resolved*, That we congratulate the many patrons of this College in the accomplishment of this important project, which, under the guidance of Divine Providence, will expand into maturer life to elevate and bless all who come under her well-defined system of instruction, pervaded with the pure doctrine of our Evangelical and distinctively Protestant Christianity.

*Resolved*, That we pledge our individual and united efforts in behalf of the interests of Ursinus College, to still further extend its growing usefulness and secure its permanent future success.

The next Term of the College will open September 1. Applications for admission either into the Academic or Collegiate Departments, should be made without delay. Address Rev. Dr. Bomberger, Freeland, Montgomery county, Pa. The Academic

Department will be reorganized and provided with increased means of efficiency.

*Acknowledgments.*—Received for educational use in Ursinus College, from :

Rev. H. Hess.....	\$10 00
Huntingdon Reformed church.....	50 00
Salem Reformed church (Rev. Hibshman).....	9 47
Rev. A. B. Shenkle, Millersville Reformed church.....	29 00
Rev. Maxwell Rowland, St. Matthews, 6 84 }	
E. Vincent, 16 21 }	23 05
Heidelberg Reformed church, Philad'a (additional). ....	8 00
Rev. A. G. Dole, from a child in McConnelstown cong'n. ....	1 00

For all these contribution, to the cause of education for the ministry in our Institution, we are sincerely thankful. But it was especially gratifying to receive the last from a little boy only four years old. That dollar was the saving of pennies for many months. Instead of spending all he got on himself, for trifles, he took pleasure in heeding the counsel of pious parents, and denying his childish tastes for the sake of doing good. Children may be childlike and natural. And yet it is good for them to learn to bear the yoke of some self-denial in their youth. We may hope that the Lord will accept this gift, as we sincerely pray that He may bless the youthful giver, and incline him in his earliest years not only to give his money, but his heart, unto that kind Heavenly Father who gave His own dear Son to save little children, and bless them with the riches of His grace.

It will cheer our friends, and invite them to a continuance of their aid; to consider that already the contributions received are yielding good fruits, in supplying the church with earnest and qualified laborers for the field.

*The Annual Catalogue* for 1872-3 is published and ready for distribution. Any persons desiring a copy, will be furnished by applying to us. It should be widely circulated. The catalogue shows that the Institution is making rapid progress in the most essential features. The aggregate number of students was not quite as large as during the previous year. For reasons partly understood, the Academic Department was not as full. But the College proper, with its *forty-one students*, indicates vigorous growth. And more students have been in attendance during the entire year

than heretofore, as the receipts for *tuition* (nearly \$3,000), &c., show. Taking the year through, there has been most substantial progress. Let us thank God and take courage.

*Commencement at Heidelberg College.*—Heidelberg College had its commencement on the 19th of June. The graduating class numbered nine members, all of whom received the usual degrees. The orations were well prepared and delivered, giving full proof that their studies had been wisely directed.

The Baccalaureate was delivered by the President, Rev. George W. Williard, D.D., in the Reformed church, on Sunday evening previous. All the exercises were well attended, and left a good impression.

The attendance during the past year in the College and Seminary was very encouraging, there having been one hundred and thirty-nine in the College and Preparatory, and twenty-two in the Seminary.

The next collegiate year will begin Wednesday, the 3d of September, 1873.

Any one wishing to obtain further information, can do so by writing to the President, Rev. George W. Williard, D.D., Tiffin, Ohio.

---

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*Thanks to the many friends* who have remembered the *Monthly* during the past four weeks, by paying what they owed. Let the *many in arrears* promptly follow this good example, and share our gratitude.

*None will* complain, we feel sure, that so large a portion of the present number is given to the *College Repertory*, and an account of our recent Commencement, even to the curtailment or exclusion of other matter. The patrons of the *Monthly* are the warm friends of the college, and for like reasons. Both represent the same cause, the maintenance, defence, and promotion of Evangelical Christianity on Reformed, Apostolic principles, and this, especially, as a means of counteracting and defeating a scheme or movement openly and secretly adverse to those principles. Hence the interest felt in whatever pertains to the work of Ursinus College, as an important and indispensable means, under the blessing of God, of serving and securing the general cause. Hence,



too, the numerous expressions of sincere joy at the success of the Institution, and its efficiency in furnishing young men for the ministry, fitted by divine grace, and a diligently prosecuted course of study for great usefulness in the sacred calling. Seven such (including the two brethren sent forth a year ago) have now gone out. All have found fields of labor to which they have been welcomed, or are earnestly sought after. And, if we could supply them, seven more could at once find as many charges seeking pastors from our school. Could there be better proof that we are meeting a great want? Could there be stronger reasons for aiding us in our work?

*Masks.* No clearer evidence of the real success of a good cause could be furnished than the attempts of its opponents to steal its dress, use its language, and march to its step. When an enemy, finding its schemes failing, and its peculiar weapons, or mode of operation, whether in assaults or machinations, useless and abortive, or even hurtful to its cause, casts the weapons away, or hides them, and feigns an abandonment of its warfare, it is significant of something. And when a party which has made audacious and defiant attempts to subvert old established principles and existing institutions, and which has shrunk from no unfair or violent measures to crush resistance to its revolutionary schemes, suddenly calms down, assumes gentle manners, ceases from its bold endeavors, drops its previous open hostility to evangelical doctrines, and even begins to use again terms and language it had denounced, and adopts, in words, the speech of those whom it affected to despise—what can it all mean? *Masks?*

Well, whatever else such shifting and turning may signify, these two things are certain:

1. Finding that it cannot conquer by pursuing, openly, the line all along adopted, policy, if nothing else, has made it necessary to change front, and try another line.

2. That such mere change of front, is not to be relied upon, so long as there is no open and frank acknowledgment of past errors and wrong, and an equally open and frank renunciation of the errors and wrongs, and hearty return to the forsaken and injured faith.

Our friends will not, after the experiences through which they have seen the church pass, let themselves be deceived. Cunning masks may change men's looks; they do not change their hearts, their creed, their scheme. The hands covered with the shaggy skins of animals taken in the chase, might delude blind Isaac, but we are not yet so easily misled. When the French found themselves hard pressed by the sturdy Prussians, they plead strongly for an armistice. But the Germans understood the situation, and were not to be caught.

It is human to err. The best men have made mistakes, by yielding to vain fancies, and to foolish speculations. And true Christian charity should ever be ready to forgive and forget past faults or wrongs, or evidence of sincere repentance and a hearty renunciation of the wrong. But no Christian charity requires us to take mere formal changes, or a change of tactics, for such repentance and reformation. As long as doctrines and practices, hostile to established truth and usages, are inculcated and maintained; as long as the work of

strengthening fortifications and multiplying arms still goes on, *charity* says, be not deceived; watch, pray, and work.

How often, in past times, when Popery found it could not carry some new hierarchical dogma, or fasten some new yoke upon the necks of its subjects, did it seem wholly to give up the attempt! But it only postponed the scheme until it gained more strength. Finding that candid, open-faced measures would not answer, it put on *masks*.

With our eyes open, should we allow such history to repeat itself, to our spiritual injury, and, what is of infinitely more account, to the subversion or betrayal of the truth?

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

*Under the New Postal Law we propose to pay the postage on all Reviews and Monthlies, and other exchanges not notified to the contrary.*

*From the Presbyterian Board, 1334 Chestnut st., Philadelphia.*

*Thoughts on the Decalogue*, by Howard Crosby, Pastor of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian church, New York. Dr. Crosby uses an able pen, and in this practical treatise has furnished much valuable instruction, in a small compass, upon a most momentous subject.

*A Tenth Anniversary Sermon*, by Rev. John Ault, Pastor of the Reformed church, Mechanicsburg, Pa. Published by the congregation. The sermon is a pleasant, grateful review of an active and useful pastorate, and presents facts which show that the esteemed Pastor's labors were not in vain.

*Annual Catalogue of Heidelberg College and Theological Seminary, Tiffin, Ohio. 1872-3.* It is with pleasure we notice the continued prosperity of this Institution. The number of students in the several departments was 161, including 22 in the Theological Seminary. With an ample course of study, and an energetic Faculty, the Institution deserves cordial support.

*The Heidelberg Teacher and Lesson Papers* for July and August (in one No.) have been received. Richly does the publication merit the success attending it. The editors of the several departments are doing their work ably and faithfully, and we rejoice that they are being warmly encouraged. Subscriptions may be sent to Rev. S. Mease, "Christian World" office, 178 Elm street, Cincinnati.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

*Church Dedication.* The dedication of the Reformed and Lutheran (union) church, of *Pleasant Valley*, Bucks county, took place on Whitsuntide. It was a great day for our esteemed brother, Rev. H. Hess, the pastor, and the good

people of his charge. The building is not large, but it is pleasant, convenient, and an ornament to the whole neighborhood. Such a crowd of vehicles as was gathered at the church on the appointed day, we have never seen before. It was estimated that there were four hundred or more buggies and carriages on the ground. The congregation being chiefly German, the morning and afternoon were assigned to services in that language; it was our privilege to preach at the former. At the latter, the Rev. Mr. Apple (Lutheran), of Mt. Bethel, preached an appropriate, earnest discourse. This was followed by the dedication, conducted by the two pastors. In the evening the church was again crowded (somewhat to our surprise) for an English service, at which it fell to our lot to preach.

In this first visit to Pleasant Valley, we found much to delight and cheer us. The faithful evangelical preaching and labors of brother Hess, have evidently been richly blessed. Only we deeply regretted to find him still somewhat feeble and disabled through a paralytic attack which seized him some months ago. May the Lord abundantly sustain him under the trial, restore him to full strength again, and spare him many years to a people who have learned warmly to love him and to appreciate his faithful zeal.

[From the Lancaster, Pa., Daily Express.]

*Ursinus College.*—In the brief report published in this paper last Saturday, of the Commencement of Ursinus College, located at Freeland, Montgomery co., Pa., we omitted to notice the entertainment which was given by the President of the Institution, Rev. Dr. Bomberger, in honor of the graduating class and friends who were present.

Refreshments were served up in the evening on the ground of his residence, which were partaken of by over a hundred persons. The President of the Board of Trustees responded to a call for a speech, in which he gave an exhibit of business prospects of the Institution, which were encouraging for the future.

He was followed by Dr. Bomberger, who spoke for the Faculty in his usual felicitous vein. Captain Denues, of Lancaster, closed with a handsome acknowledgment in behalf of the strangers present. Altogether, this entertainment was one of the pleasantest episodes, in connection with the Commencement exercises, of this flourishing Institution.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.—AUGUST, 1873.—No. 8.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN EDUCATION.

URSINUS COLLEGE, June 26, 1873.

*Rev. F. W. Kremer, D.D.:*

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR—The Schaff Literary Society tenders you its sincere thanks for the address delivered by you before the Literary Societies of the College, and in appreciation of its worth requests a copy for publication in the *Reformed Church Monthly*.

Yours, with respect,

A. M. TICE, *President*.

H. T. SPANGLER, *Secretary pro. tem.*

LEBANON, PA., July 2, 1873.

*Messrs. A. M. Tice and H. T. Spangler:*

GENTLEMEN—Your kind note of the 26th ult., requesting on behalf of the Schaff Literary Society a copy of my address for publication in the *Reformed Church Monthly*, has been received. In deference to the wishes of your Society, and with the hope that giving the address a permanent form will add to its usefulness, I hereby place it at your disposal.

Yours, very respectfully,

F. W. KREMER.

*Gentlemen of the Schaff and Zwinglian Literary Societies:* The literary festival which we inaugurate this evening, involves elements and comprises facts which are not common on similar occasions. Our festivities embrace the graduation of the first class in Ursinus College. The fact, in itself interesting, is associated with others of kindred significance and importance. This first Commencement demonstrates the recent origin of the college. Here, then, we are surrounded with the freshness and vigor of youth. We see here no dull stagnation, but the evidences of a warm life of literary and theological zeal.

The Institution is under the direction of an able and earnest Faculty, at whose head is placed the first graduate of Marshall College, and one of its most gifted and able representatives, embodying in an eminent degree the life, genius and spirit of Merceburg in its best, purest and palmiest days. The theological basis of your college is that of the immortal Ursinus and his illustrious colleague, Olevianus. And as Societies, you have very properly recognized the literary and theological ability of a Zwingle and a Schaff.

In view of the successful establishment of this college, the basis on which it rests, its promising prospects, and the prosperity of your respective Societies, I tender you, young gentlemen, my cordial congratulations.

Having adverted to a few pleasing facts in relation to the college, I would further engage your attention on this interesting occasion with a brief discussion of the following question : *The Religious Element in Education : its necessity to true morality and freedom.*

*Man is a unit.* In the term person, is included the totality of his being. But unity does not necessarily exclude diversity. The tree is a unit, and yet it presents a complex form. We speak of its several parts—its roots, trunk, limbs and foliage. Still the tree is but one living organism, and is pervaded in all its parts by a common life.

Thus man is an individual, and possesses one *life* ; nevertheless, his person includes a variety of functions, powers and faculties. He possesses one life, but a complex nature—physical, intellectual and moral.

Moreover, the tree is designed to serve a variety of purposes and uses. Whilst it delights the eye by its beautiful form and rich foliage, and invites the weary to regale themselves under its refreshing shade, it offers its trunk and limbs to an almost endless variety of mechanical purposes, so indispensable in all the arts of life. So the individual man, with his complex nature, and sustaining different relations, is designed to serve different purposes, and to move in different spheres of activity.

He sustains an important relation to the sphere of nature, to intellect, and especially to morals and religion. But, like the oak is developed from the acorn by the legitimate operation of laws, called into exercise by certain necessary conditions, so the life of

man, as it includes his threefold nature, must be legitimately and harmoniously developed, in order that we may have a complete exhibition of his entire character. Hence we speak of physical education, and mental and moral culture. In his physical character man is closely allied to nature, to the earth, the vegetable and the mere sensitive creation. But in his intellectual and moral powers he is allied to a higher world, to spiritual intelligences, and even to Deity himself. Hence, in the evolution of his functions, powers and faculties, due respect should always be had to every part of his nature. The entire man should be simultaneously and harmoniously developed. Not the mere physical, to the neglect of the intellectual, nor the intellectual to the neglect of the moral. The laws and wants of his *entire being* should be faithfully consulted, the conditions of his complete development be supplied; for thus alone can be unfolded in proper symmetry, beauty and strength, the various powers of his nature. The development of his physical powers demands obedience to physical laws, the laws of life. If the body is to arrive at vigorous maturity, regard must be had to regimen, exercise, rest and other necessary conditions. If the mind, with its various faculties, is to exhibit its proper power and exalted capabilities, it must be subjected to a process of educational training. And if the *moral* nature of man is to be elevated to a proper standard, and qualified for its appropriate sphere, it must be brought under the influence of such principles and culture as are adapted to its peculiar constitution. And inasmuch as the moral nature of man constitutes his chief glory, and includes the principles of all his thoughts and actions, it is evident that it demands paramount attention. At the same time the intellectual powers must not be neglected, the mind must be cultivated and stored with useful knowledge.

A philosophical conception of this subject requires us to maintain that the most complete development of the entire man not only secures his highest glory and happiness, but invests him at the same time with the highest qualifications for the right discharge of the numerous duties comprehended in the various relations he may sustain in life.

These remarks may suffice as preliminary, and may be regarded as the basis to the discussion of the subject already announced.

From what has now been said, it is evident that the true idea



of education cannot be realized by mere intellectual culture. The intellect may be unfolded to the highest possible degree; it may be enriched from the stores of literature and science. If the moral powers should be neglected, all such intellectual achievements would entitle an individual to comparatively little respect.

The chief excellency and glory of man is his moral nature—the heart, its powers and affections. This should receive first, paramount attention. A man may be good without being learned, and he may possess extensive intellectual acquirements without being good. There is, therefore, no necessary connection between mere learning and a pure morality. Voltaire was learned, but equally impious. Whilst he possessed a brilliant and highly cultivated intellect, his heart was thoroughly corrupt. This unhappy instance is but one among many. Hence we maintain that education in its *highest* and *purest* form, can consist only in union with a pure morality.

All truth, scientific and moral, has its source in God, the fountain of truth. Hence we can acknowledge no opposition between learning and piety. The highest form of knowledge of which we are capable, is the knowledge of God in Christ. This knowledge is possible only through the medium of revelation. On this divine record, then, must we place our feet, as the only true and safe point of observation. From this radiant centre we can survey our own being, and every interest beyond ourselves. From this standpoint of unerring truth we can understand the origin, the spirit and the end of science. "In thy light we shall see light." In this inmost sanctuary of divine revelation, and in living union with the Fountain of Life, we may see how all things come from God, and how all return to Him again. We shall see and feel how God is in history, and in what sense He is in the arts and sciences, and how all are intended to be pervaded by the spirit of piety, and rendered tributary to the furtherance of His kingdom and the highest welfare of man. In this relation to God, man is elevated above mere nature, as comprehended in the physical universe; elevated above his own physical, intellectual and morally depraved constitution. By virtue of his new creation in Christ, he is properly himself, and is no longer at the mercy of influences and forces that would bind him to mere sensual and perishable interests.

Here, then, we have the true idea of *moral freedom*. In this

relation to God, man moves freely in the true and proper law of his being—the law of supreme love to God and equal love to man. Human freedom, accordingly, is not *Antinomianism*; it includes the highest conceivable authority, the authority of God. But the morally free yield themselves up to this authority from choice, and without the least constraint. They find their highest freedom and purest happiness in their unconstrained obedience to the divine law.

We have now seen that the most perfect attention to man's physical nature, and the highest degree of mental culture, without due attention to the heart, would leave man to the control of his inferior nature, and, as a consequence, destitute of moral freedom and true happiness. In this condition he would be like a wandering star, or the wretched bark, tempest-tossed, without chart or compass to guide him into the haven of safety and of rest.

From what has already been said of mere intellectual training, aside from proper attention to the heart, it is easy to infer that not mere education, not the general diffusion of knowledge, can be regarded as the basis of free institutions, but the prevalence of a sound, evangelical morality. Not indeed that such morality or religion can or should exist alone, divorced from education, but that it constitutes the only reliable and proper guarantee of civil freedom.

The right reception of evangelical truth not only reveals to man his different relations, and the various duties these relations comprehend, but such is its divine energy that it produces the disposition and supplies the ability to discharge those duties and obligations.

I am fully aware, however, that many ignore and not a few openly reject this position. They attempt continually to separate religion from our social and civil life. Such are clamorous for the general diffusion of knowledge, the universal prevalence of education. They would have the country dotted over with school-houses, academies and colleges, but would carefully exclude from them the book of God, and every religious publication; under the plea of guarding against the inculcation of sectarian principles, they would wholly exclude from the schools every religious element. The constant cry is, let the masses be instructed, let our State appropriations be liberal and free, for the accomplishment of this *summum bonum*, this universal panacea of all our social and

political evils. Mistaken men! how unphilosophical and false is your position! Education, separated from religious principles, is by no means reliable for good. If it be united with the mind destitute of moral integrity, there is no assurance whatever that it will not prove a curse rather than a blessing. At all events, it is quite certain that the spirit of selfishness will employ this power to accomplish its own sinister ends, whether that result chance to be in favor of or against the general good. This conclusion is a logical deduction from the principles of depraved human nature. And that it is a true conclusion has been abundantly, though painfully, confirmed by the entire past history of our race.

To prove this assertion, I now invite your attention to a few historical facts.

"I have but one lamp," says Patrick Henry, "by which my feet are guided, the lamp of experience."

I have already enunciated the universal voice of history, and that voice proclaims the incontestible truth, that "righteousness exalteth a nation."

Passing by sacred history, which furnishes almost innumerable proofs in favor of the position taken, I turn to the pages of profane history for additional testimony to the same truth.

It will readily be admitted that every form of religion exerts upon its abettors a peculiar and decided influence. This fact is clearly established in the history of all nations.

And the influence of any religious system will always be in proportion to the truth it contains, and the faith of those who are its professed advocates. Accordingly, Pagan systems also carry with them a measure of influence and power. The man of faith among the ancient Greeks and Romans, felt himself under a powerful constraint to practice many of the virtues, and to guard against vice and injustice. Such believed in a higher power than that which is merely human. If they did not believe in the one only true God, they believed in a plurality of Gods. We find accordingly in the nations alluded to, not only systems of religious belief, but also different forms of religious worship. We read of their magnificent temples, their priests, and their sacrifices.

And, with all the errors of these systems, it is undeniable that so long as they retained a firm hold on the confidence of the people, they were comparatively prosperous and happy; and, on the other hand, it is equally true, that as public faith in the gods



diminished, so every species of injustice, luxury and vice increased. And, it is here to be observed, that in these circumstances the prevalence of education had no power to check, in the least, this fearful downward tendency. For facts, we refer to those nations separately. And first, to *Greece*. Athens was the eye of Greece. This city possessed a system of education highly favorable to intellectual culture. It embraced in its ample requisitions the whole circle of human science. Its schools of philosophy were unsurpassed. The people were supplied with libraries richly furnished with the literature of the times, and public lectures were delivered on the various branches of science. These advantages of education were not limited to the few; they were accessible. And there is good reason to believe that the people generally availed themselves of these advantages. Cicero, in his Oration for Flaccus, pays a handsome tribute to the learning and intelligence of the Athenians. "There are present," he says, "Athenians, from whom civilization, learning, religion, agriculture, rights and laws, are thought to have originated, and been spread abroad through all the earth." If then learning, science, and general intelligence can produce and maintain those principles which can develop social and political order, integrity and justice, then we might expect the Athenians to be a very model in all these respects. Yet of this people the same orator declares, "*that they only knew what was right, but would not do it.*"

Notwithstanding the advancement of the Greeks in every department of knowledge, they were greatly degenerated in their morals. In the heroic ages they were distinguished for their justice and good faith, their private and public virtues. But at the period under review, Polybius tells us, there existed in Greece scarcely the shadow of good faith. And Cicero, in the oration from which I have already quoted, declares that neither the word nor the oath of a Greek was at all to be relied on. Licentiousness reigned to a shocking extent. For gaming they had an uncontrollable passion. Intemperance had become well nigh universal. Plato says they were accustomed to see the whole city intoxicated at the festivals. We may be told that Asiatic refinements, and the influence of an extensive foreign commerce, corrupted the fountains of national morality. Be it so. We may still inquire, why did not the superior influence which is claimed for education effectually neutralize the pernicious tendencies of

these corrupting elements? The answer is plain. Education, aside from religious principle, has no power effectually to resist and overcome the superior force of wrong elements and habits. It is the character of evil, that it creates in the depraved mind a love for itself. This love is the controlling law of the mind. Hence, the observation of Montesquieu is as true as it is philosophical: "Athens fell, because her faults appeared to her so pleasant that she was unwilling to cure them." The fall, then, of this Republic, is not traceable to a want of learning and intellectual culture, but to the *absence of the controlling power of moral principle.*

If we turn our attention to the history of Rome, we will find that the same causes there produced the same effects. The character of the early Romans was distinguished for its unbending integrity, love of justice, simplicity of faith, and sincerity of manners." "In peace and war," says Sallust, "they cultivated good morals." "Great harmony prevailed, but no avarice." Right and duty were regarded, not so much on account of the laws, as from natural impulse. Discord and dissimulation found place only against enemies. Citizens strove with citizens only in virtue. Magnificence prevailed in the sacrifices to the gods, frugality in domestic affairs, and fidelity towards friends. Much that was humane, beautiful, and attractive, was found in the domestic relation. And although the households of Rome could not be compared with a Christian home, or her wives and mothers with Christian matrons, yet she possessed many such wives as Lucretia, and many such mothers as Cornelia. Such were the high and palmy days of Rome's prosperity, the times of the Cincinnati, the Cammilla, the Fabii, and the Reguli. The early Romans cherished the most sacred regard for the preservation of both public and private faith, and especially for the solemn obligation of the oath. This reverential regard for the oath exerted a most salutary influence in favor of private and public justice and virtue. Even at a later period in Roman history, when vice and corruption had obscured the former glory of the nation, the Emperor Maximus calls the oath "the sacred mystery of the Roman government."

Polybius affirms, that the greatest superiority of the Roman political constitution consisted in their belief respecting the gods. The influence of religion, he says, both over individuals and in

the affairs of the state, was carried to the highest possible extent. This state of things, however, it is well known did not continue. Through the introduction of a skeptical philosophy, faith in the gods was gradually destroyed among the masses of the people, and the deplorable consequences of unbridled licentiousness might be witnessed on every hand. The period hastened on when Cæsar could assert, that death is an eternal sleep; and when Seneca could say, "No one is any longer so much a child that he must be shown that there is no Cerberus, or Tartarus." Many at this period rejected all belief in future retribution, and even in future existence, and denied the very being of a God.

What in these circumstances could prevent the downfall of the Roman Republic? Surely not education—intellectual culture. In this respect the Roman people were at the zenith of their glory, having added to their own literary treasures the learning of the Greeks. But having made shipwreck of their theology, having surrendered their faith in the gods, they were under the influence of an unbridled recklessness, of unrestrained passion and selfishness, which rendered their overthrow at once fearful and certain. Not the want of knowledge, not the absence of intellectual light and culture can be regarded as the cause of this melancholy national catastrophe, but the corruption of national morality, the presence of skepticism and infidelity.

Here, then, is an array of historical testimony, confirming the conclusions drawn from the nature of the case, and the teachings of inspiration. And the same grave and solemn lessons are taught us in the history of modern nations. As an instance, I turn to the *French Revolution*, in the reign of Louis XVI. I can but refer to that reign of terror, to those scenes of barbarity and bloodshed. Need I point to the cause of those awful scenes? Need I say it was not the want of knowledge, of educational advantages? The cause is evident to every reader of modern history. Infidelity, with its dark train of abominations, had settled like blighting mildew upon the French nation. Infidel associations were multiplied on every hand, and the seeds of anarchy, corruption and death were profusely scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land. Dr. Dwight, enumerating the tenets of this satanic school says, they taught "that God is nothing; that government is a curse, and authority is an usurpation; that civil society is the only apostasy of man; that the



possession of property is robbery ; that purity and natural affection are mere prejudices ; and that assassination, poisoning, and other crimes are not only lawful, but even virtuous." No wonder that the thunderbolts of Divine vengeance were sent in fearful destruction among such a race of bold blasphemers ! No wonder that Paris was converted into a vast slaughter-house, slippery with the blood of thousands of its slain ! How true it is that sin is destructive. Infidelity and irreligion are not only the bane and curse of the individual and the social community, but must prove also the inevitable downfall and ruin of the State. This was the judgment also of our illustrious Washington, the father of our country, as enunciated in his memorable farewell address. He says : "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who would labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, the firmest props of the duties of men and citizens."

I will yet refer to our early American Congress, whose noble position on this question deserves to be held in perpetual and grateful recollection. In 1777 Congress appointed a committee to advise as to the printing an edition of thirty thousand Bibles. But as sufficient paper could not be procured for this purpose, the Committee on Commerce was ordered to import, at the expense of Congress, twenty thousand Bibles from Holland, Scotland, or elsewhere, into the ports of the States of the Union. Well might Lord Chatham, in his eulogy on the young American Congress, designate this act as above all Grecian and all Roman fame.

We have been looking at some prominent facts on the pages of history, and it is meet we should learn from them salutary lessons. They should serve as beacon lights to save us from the breakers and quicksands of a false philosophy and pernicious practices. Human nature, always and everywhere the same, ever tends away from God and truth. If, therefore, humanity is not to sink beneath its own corruption, it must be permeated by the leaven of the Gospel. No mere self-culture, no systems of a Christless philosophy, and no social reform schemes can ever avail to produce right principles and a right course of action.

This the entire past history of the world has most clearly demonstrated. Science, though of heavenly origin, carries with it no

remedial, saving power ; it comprehends no Christ, no salvation. Good and serviceable as science is when its principles are rightly applied, it cannot elevate human nature to its proper plane ; and is even in many instances perverted from its high purposes, and made to serve unrighteous and wicked ends. The *electric telegraph*, with its lightning despatches, is to a vast extent used to further unrighteous schemes and projects. Steam, a most important and valuable agent, is also wickedly abused, and among its perversions is the employment on the Christian Sabbath of not less than twenty thousand men on the railroads in the United States. For these men the Lord's day is blotted out. They are torn away from their homes and God's sanctuaries, and whilst running their trains on the day of rest, are puffing defiance against the God of heaven.

A disregard of God and the plainest principles of Christianity is manifest on every hand, and among all grades of society ; among the educated as well as among the illiterate. That men of intelligence and culture are not always proof against venal influences, is, alas, too evident. What is the testimony furnished on this question by our State and National Legislatures ? What bribery and reeking corruption ! Who is not familiar with the notorious *Credit Mobilier* swindle, and the *back-pay* humiliation ! And what does it mean that the public press of all parties is ready to join a grossly deceived and defrauded constituency in a grand jubilee on the adjournment of the State Legislature and the national Congress ? And what is the cause of all this fraud and public theft as practiced by unprincipled men connected with the different political organizations ? Is it the want of education, of intellectual culture ? Verily not. It is the absence of the religious element, the transforming power of the blessed Gospel. In the absence of Christian principle, education is often found not a conservative, but a dangerous power.

There are still other sores on our body politic which tend to waste its life and weaken its energies. One of these is the *woman's rights* heresy.

Whilst this movement may be allowed to carry with it a measure of truth and right, its soul is essentially anti-Biblical, and so anti-Christian. This odious creed would place the woman on the same plane with the man, she participating in all the avocations of life. In clear opposition to the teachings of the Bible, she is

to occupy the pulpit, and so also the rostrum, and address like men, promiscuous assemblies.

This unnatural movement, instead of adding to, detracts from female power and influence, and inflicts upon the sex a wrong far more to be deprecated than all the wrongs of which this school complain. Those who resist these wrongs, which the notorious Woodhull-Claffin school so persistently attempt to inflict upon their noble but outraged sex, are the true friends of woman's rights. The theory we are reprobating is as false in philosophy as it is in theology.

The laxity of the marriage relation is another plague-spot which, cancer-like, preys upon the vitals of the nation. Christ, the great lawgiver, allows but one cause for a divorce, whilst human legislation allows many, and some of these of a most trivial character. This anti-Biblical legislation, and the consequent facility of obtaining a divorce, robs, in the eyes of the people, the marriage relation of much of its sacredness. The evil is one of a most vital and serious character.

Its tendency is to undermine both the family and the State, and to inflict untold evil on the church and cause of Christ.

We have now noticed in brief some of the wrong and destructive elements which exist in our beloved, and, in many respects, noble as well as highly favored country. And in reference to them all, we confidently assert that they owe their existence not so much to the want of education as to *the absence of Bible instruction and thorough Christian training.*

If, then, the wrong unscriptural tendencies at work in our country, and which so much threaten private and public virtue and the safety of the State, are to be successfully checked, more room must be made for the religious element. With mere intellectual culture, with some slight and perhaps superficial attention to religion, the evil must go forward and increase in volume until the folly and madness of the nation will become apparent in its downfall and ruin. Let our public and parochial schools be supplied with competent and pious teachers; let the Bible be read and prayers offered, and let the unsectarian religious literature so warmly recommended by the heads of the school department of our State, be introduced into our schools. Let our Sabbath schools be made still more decidedly evangelical, solid and efficient. Let family instruction and pastoral catechization



receive growing and still more earnest attention. Let the "Church of God, the pillar and ground of the truth," bring to bear in holy love, zeal and faith, all the means with which Christ, her head, furnished her; and skepticism and irreligion, in all their hateful and destructive forms, will be made to yield to the superior power of God's truth and grace, and our beloved land will become in very deed Immanuel's land, where God and His Christ shall be honored, and the nation shall rejoice in such a state of peace and prosperity as never marked her history in her palmiest days.

---

REGENERATION BY BAPTISM.

*An Exposure of a New-Order Error.*

ARTICLE III.—*More Scripture Proofs Examined.*

MR. RUPP and our readers will please remember distinctly that we are *not* finding fault with him or his school for teaching that *the Sacraments are means of grace*. Nobody has ever complained of their doing that. And when he says, as he does, in opening his third *Messenger* article, that the doctrine of baptismal grace has been denounced and condemned by those who oppose the absurd teachings of Nevinism, he simply imitates his great instructors in asserting what he cannot prove.

It is the doctrine that *the grace of Baptism consists in an emanation from the substance of God transmitted to the soul of the child or adult baptized, through Baptism, as the organic channel*, that calls forth our opposition and condemnation. *This doctrine* we pronounce unscriptural, contrary to the established faith of the Reformed church, and very thoughtful in its tendencies. To sacramental grace, in the gospel sense, we hold. This Nevinite attempt to foist a pantheising, Popish error upon the church, under pretence of advocating merely sacramental grace, is abhorrent, and deserves to be earnestly withstood.

Let Mr. R. and his more specious fellow-schoolmen be firmly held to the point in discussion. They need to be. They have a

perverse fashion of advocating an error, and when taken to task for it, or called to argue the case, of denying the position they had taken, of trying to evade the whole thing. Indeed, their manners are none too nice to keep them from calling their opponents by such somewhat offensive, or at least impolite names as liars, slanderers, and vile defamers, when those opponents press them a little too closely with damaging proofs.

Even Mr. R., in pursuing his New Testament argument, seems to have entirely forgotten what he started out to demonstrate by the Scriptures, viz: *the truth of his doctrine of an emanation*, as above stated. As seen in our last article, he no sooner enters on the Scripture proof, than he drops totally his emanation nonsense, and glides over quietly to the old and commonly received view.

In citing the case of Nicodemus, John 3, of course his main effort should have been to show that Jesus there taught that *emanation* doctrine. But much as he has to say on the passage, and a great deal of it irrelevant, he seems wholly to have lost sight of his peculiar dogma. He does not even attempt to show that the passage affords any foothold for his dogma.

So in his appeal to Matt. 28, the import of the great commission. He led us to expect that he would conclusively show that his doctrine was taught there. But in his examination of the passage, and remarks upon it, though he says a great deal which is erroneous, he does not even try to show that it teaches his favorite *profound* conceit, that regeneration is effected by an emanation of the substance of God made to pass over into the individual through baptism. What he does say may be very pleasant to those who like it. But what he does not say, nor attempt to prove, is the very thing he most needed to say and prove. It reminds one of Mark Twain's lecture on cucumbers, in which he speaks of almost every thing in and under the sun, but cucumbers.

But we cannot let our friend off in this way. He excited too strong an expectation by his bold claim of having not only the whole Bible, but "all creation," or at least the best part of it, that is the church fathers and Reformed confessions on his side, to satisfy us with some pleasant platitudes, in the shape of a shuffling commentary upon a few passages correctly quoted but miserably misinterpreted. What we want and have a right to demand, is proof that the Scriptures teach that famous *emanation-regeneration* theory.

Possibly, however, he was simply skirmishing in his treatment of those passages—preparing the way for his strong proof. Let us see. Give the party a fair chance to make out their case if they can. What it was found impossible to beat out of John 3, and Matt. 28, may perhaps be extracted from other Scriptures. So we turn to the case of

*Paul's Conversion, Acts 22: 10, &c.,*

taken in connection with Acts 9: 1, &c., and other passages throwing light upon it.

Here, if anywhere, the supporters of the Nevinite theory should find something to suit their purpose. How hard Mr. R. tried to find it, is evident from first to last. How utterly he failed appears from the fact, that in the half column he devotes to it, he cannot find room for one sentence in vindication of his peculiar dogma. The only, the best conclusion he can gain is, that "Paul's baptism and the washing away of his sins *coincided* in time, and the one was the *medium* of the other." (Q. E. D.) Yes; but even admitting this, for argument's sake, this is not the point to be proven. *Was Paul's baptism his regeneration in the sense, that a part of the substance of God passed over through baptism into the centre of his soul?* That is the question, and we tenaciously hold the school represented by Mr. R. to it.

But whilst the very point to be proven, and which it was promised should be proven, is *evaded* in this way, Mr. R. does say some things regarding Paul's case which merit passing notice. For instance, he refers to the Lord's injunction to Paul, to "arise and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." On this Brother R. says, very soberly, as though uttering some new truth, "Christ carries forward His work of grace among men, *through* men." Indeed! and we are to feel greatly indebted to the profound sagacity of this new-order school for making this notable discovery! Why, there is hardly a man or woman in the Reformed or any other evangelical church, who did not hear *this* doctrine from his grandfather and grandmother, uncles and aunts, long before the light of Nevinite lucubrations dawned upon the church.

And this we are to accept in lieu of proofs and illustrations of the great dogma of regeneration by, and efflux of, the substance of God into the soul of man! We cannot see the point.



Since, however, our worthy friend R. did indulge in some wanderings from the theme he had chosen, how did he not happen to note some other still more *significant* points in this case of Paul?

Why, for instance, did he pass by the remarkable facts, that both in Paul's first conviction and conversion, as well as in his subsequent baptism, there was no calling in of the sacerdotal functions of a special class of men? Nevinism, like Popery, makes extravagantly high account of the ministry as a specific priesthood, of the altar, &c., &c. Drs. Higbee, Gans, Davis, Appel and Apple, S. Miller, Giesy (formerly), Nevin and Gerhart, have severally and collectively delighted in "magnifying," as they would have it, their office.

Here, now, one might suppose, would be a case which should furnish material for their purpose. Saul of Tarsus, the most zealous and active foe of the cause of Christ, is to be brought to repentance, to faith in Christ. How shall the conquest be effected? Brother R. says, unqualifiedly, unconditionally, *Christ does the work through men*. And, just to see how blind men are who will not see, R. affirms this in the face of what the verses immediately preceding the one quoted most plainly report, viz.: that Paul was brought to conviction and conversion, *not* through the agency of man, *but by the direct personal interposition of Christ Himself*. "*Is not this significant?*"

Nor is this all. Even after Paul had been arrested, convicted and converted in this way, without any human agency, by the direct power of the Lord Jesus Himself, to whom was he sent for further instruction in regard to his duty? To Peter, or John, or James, or some other specially apostolic man? Not at all. He was sent simply to "*one Ananias* (in Damascus), a devout man," and who seems not to have held any official position in the church.

Here, now, was something for friend R. to write about, if he wished to divert attention from his failure to find Scripture proof for his regeneration theory. How came he to overlook it?

But the entertainment afforded by his peculiar treatment of this case of Paul's, had almost betrayed us into an oversight of his equally interesting way of turning

*The Pentecostal Wonder,*

in Acts 2, to account. After quoting verse 38, he asks, exultingly,

"What was the end of baptism here? Plainly the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, &c.—regeneration." Well, as said above, suppose it be so (which we do not admit), that is not your doctrine. Your doctrine is, that regeneration is effected by an emanation from the substance, God. Prove that, or try to prove it, and you shall have credit for honesty, and you may possibly convince us that you are right. But if you can't prove it, candidly say so, yield the point, renounce the error, and return to the faith of your fathers.

His next instance, is the case of the

*John Baptist Disciples, Acts 19.*

Besides wholly evading the point at issue here again, our young friend R. falls into a strange blunder by not distinguishing between the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost. To follow him up in this mistake would lead us out of our way and waste precious time. But it would, possibly, have afforded some satisfaction if Mr. R. had tried to reconcile his assumption that these disciples were not regenerated; had not, in any renewing sense, received the Holy Ghost.

It is expressly declared, that they were *believers*. Now, St. Paul as explicitly declares, "*No man can say that Jesus is the Christ, but by the Holy Ghost.*" Can Nevinism fairly and honestly harmonize these two things upon its theory? As soon as it attempts to do so, we shall ask it to explain how it can consistently ask a candidate for baptism to declare, as in one breath, that whilst he comes to be pardoned, delivered from the devil, and regenerated through baptism, he yet believes in his heart that he has been forgiven, delivered from the devil, and regenerated, before he has received baptism?

This is done in the New-order form for baptizing adults.

Mr. R. devotes almost the four entire columns of his third article in the *Messenger* to an attempt to make two other Scriptural passages serve his purpose. We say two, because though he quotes three, two of the three cover the same ground. They are—

*Rom. 6: 3-4, with Coloss. 2: 10, 12, and Titus 3: 5.*

Here, as in the passages previously quoted, Mr. Rupp entirely disregards the doctrine which he teaches, and defends in the *Review*, and which Drs. Nevin and Gerhart endorsed. He

appears to have forgotten all about the *emanation* theory and regeneration, as consisting in a transmission through baptism of the substance of God. This was the doctrine he undertook to defend by Scriptures. But dropping it, he goes to other ground, takes up and argues a radically different view of the case, and yet seems to delude himself with the fancy that he is all the while sticking to his first point.

From this we may fairly infer, that he virtually abandons the attempt to prove his emanation theory. If he has done so, he should frankly confess the fact.

But although he does not even try to show that the passages he quotes support the Nevinite fancy on the subject, he quietly assumes that the doctrine he draws out of them is substantially the same thing. Let us then look at this point in passing.

What then is the view of baptism and baptismal regeneration, which is in this way quietly substituted for the one which it was proposed to prove by Scripture? We answer in Mr. R.'s own words :

"Baptism is the first and principle means through which men are to be made Christians." "The end to be reached through it, (and through it alone), is a change wrought by the Holy Ghost in the life of the soul itself." "The implantation of a new germ of life." Union with Christ is "brought to pass through baptism, (through which alone) the Christian (made such by baptism) has the forgiveness of sin, the germ of a new life from Christ by the Holy Ghost as the principle of his sanctification, and of his ultimate complete deliverance from sin." "Baptism is the instrumental cause of regeneration."

In a word, then, the Nevinite doctrine, as here set forth and endorsed by its leaders, is, that water baptism is regeneration and the remission of sin, and that neither can be effected or secured, as a rule, without baptism. Bad as this doctrine is, any one can see the broad difference between it and the other view, which is the real dogma of the school. It is the Romish and Puseyite doctrine without the pantheistic combination of Nevinism.

As stated in a former article, our argument does not require us to follow Mr. R. into his attempted defence of *this* view by appeals to the Scriptures ; and to do so at any length would only help him, by turning the minds of our readers away from the grosser heresy of Nevinism. We think it better, therefore, to re-



serve a critical consideration of the passages quoted, for another series of articles upon *Nevinite perversions of the Scriptures*.

Still it may be well at once briefly to meet a few points, and expose some mistakes made by writers of the Nevinite school, in their treatment of such Scriptures.

1. It is very significant that they give such decided preference to Romish and Puseyite interpretations of the Scriptures in question, over commonly received Evangelical Protestant interpretations.

2. The sense in which they take those Scriptures, was one not known in our church until it was introduced and advocated by Dr. J. W. Nevin and his school.

3. But turning to the passages themselves, we note the following errors in the Nevinite use (or rather abuse) of them.

1. They entirely overlook the plain and undeniable fact, that in the language of Scriptures as in that of common life, the sign or symbol is often figuratively put for the thing signified or symbolized. The real, essential distinction of the two is not confounded, nor meant to be represented as identical. But the one is named as the formal representation of the other. Thus in the Lord's Supper it is said of the bread, "*this is my body*," a phrase which no one for a moment misunderstood, until after nearly three hundred years' strange philosophies and philosophical conceits had crept into and perverted the doctrines of Christianity.

2. So of baptism. When St. Paul speaks of *it* as a burial with Christ, and as the washing of regeneration, he knew that there was no danger of being misunderstood, as though he meant to teach that the mere sacrament or ceremony of formal baptism did all this! If he had meant this, how could he have thanked God (in writing to the Corinthians), that he had baptized none of them? Besides, in this very passage in Romans, had he not, in the preceding chapters, taught and most forcibly argued in favor of a doctrine the very opposite of that for which Nevinism and Mr. R. contend? In ch. 4: 10, 11, he had plainly taught the Romans that Abraham's regeneration, salvation, justification preceded the sacramental sign and seal of it. And in the next chapter he sets forth that doctrine of justification (which includes all other gospel blessings) which has ever been, and still is, a stumbling block and rock of offence to Papists, Puseyites, and their American brothers, the Nevinites.

How absurd, then, how recklessly perverse to make this same apostle unteach all he had taught previously, by putting such a sense into these verses of chapt 6, as is put into them by Mr. R. and his school. If Paul meant here what he is thus made to mean, he stultifies himself and the main tenor of his entire epistle, nay, of all his other epistles, especially of that to the Galatians and that to the Hebrews.

3. Nor does the case of Mr. R. improve by turning to Coloss. 2: 12. He (R.) must not have seen, or have found it inexpedient to notice, the preceding verse, though he includes it in his reference. Here Paul says expressly, that Christians are complete in Christ, by being "circumcised in Him with a circumcision *made without hands.*" Now if, as is commonly held, baptism has taken the place of circumcision, how could the apostle mean what Nevinism forces into his words? Can there be a water, formal, sacramental baptism without hands? But Paul had taught that the great essential work, involving whatever change was needful to make men real Christians *was one wrought without hands.*

4. As little does Tit. 3: 5 afford comfort to the New-order creed. For if baptism is the laver or washing of regeneration in the Nevinite sense, how could Paul be excused for thankfully boasting that he had "*not been sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel?*" This of itself is a sufficient answer for the present.

No. If the leaders of this unhappily erratic school would only exercise a little of the common sense with which men read other writings; if they would only rise above the darkening and misleading influence of their theoretical vagaries in theology, they would not fall into the absurdities of interpretation in which they are themselves floundering, and into the mire and mists of which they have led so many perplexed and struggling followers.

It has taken more space and time than we wished to give to follow our friend in his wandering. But to avoid even the appearance of evading what he offered and urged as proofs of his errors, we had to do it. Our readers will pardon the trial of their patience, and feel, we hope, not wholly unrewarded.

The next point we shall take up will be the argument, so-called, based upon what Mr. R. and his school set forth as the *doctrine of the Reformed church on the subject.*

NEVINISM A FEEDER FOR ROME.

*A Romish View of the Case.*

THE following article taken, from "*The Catholic Standard*," is from the pen of the chief Editor, G. Dering Wolff, Esq., son of the late Rev. B. C. Wolff, D.D., formerly Professor of Theology in our Seminary at Mercersburg, and brother-in-law of Rev. Theodore Appel, Professor in Franklin and Marshall College, in Lancaster. Mr. Wolff will be remembered as one of the most devoted and zealous disciples of Dr. J. W. Nevin and his school, in which he was trained for his work. He was also one of those whom that party petted and delighted to use for their purposes, as the Synod of Hagerstown, in 1868, and of Danville, still later, showed. This makes his views of Nevinism, and its relations to Popery, the more interesting.

Deeply as we deplore his defection, and decidedly as we condemn his weakness and sin, in yielding to the temptations which led to his apostasy, his *testimony* as to the first causes of his fall, and that of the many who have gone down into the vortex with him, is significant and unanswerable.

We believe firmly that what he says of the inward and outward Romish affinities of Nevinism is true. Surely, then, the gentlemen at Lancaster and Mercersburg should lay to heart his earnest *brotherly appeal* to them, no longer to halt between two opinions, merely under mercenary restraints. And if they will not openly come out and confess that they have for years been teaching doctrines false in themselves, and subversive of our Reformed faith, and as openly renounce those doctrines, we join Mr. Wolff of the *Catholic Standard*, and his coadjutor Dr. Fisher of the *Reformed Church Messenger*, in the hope that the prayer of the appellant may be speedily answered.

“RECEPTION OF A CONVERT.

“On last Sunday morning, July 6th, Rev. Edward O. Forney, a graduate of Franklin and Marshall College and also of the Theological Seminary of the (German) Reformed Church, and, until a short time previous, minister of the Reformed congregation at Norristown, Pa., was received into the loving arms of our holy Mother, the church. Mr. Forney, theologically, had belonged to the so-called Mercersburg school of thought, and was trained up intellectually and theologically under the influence of Drs. J. W. Nevin, Harbaugh, Gerhart, Higbee, and Thomas G. Apple; and by these Protestant Theological



Doctors, the first seeds of Catholic truth—so far as our knowledge extends—were implanted in his mind. He was regarded by the members of the sect which he has abandoned, as a young man of more than ordinary ability and promise. He was confessedly the most talented and eloquent Protestant preacher in Norristown. The congregation to which he preached was one which required the highest order of intellectual ability to satisfy the demands of its members—his three previous predecessors, whose ministry covered a period of twenty years (more or less), having been gentlemen of much more than ordinary talent and culture.

“His immediate predecessor was the Rev. Dr. Gans, now of Baltimore, who previously was elected to the professorship of Greek and Exegetical Theology of the Seminary of the Reformed church—a position which he declined accepting. The minister preceding Dr. Gans was Rev. P. S. Davis, now in Chambersburg, Pa., a beautiful writer and eloquent speaker; and preceding him was J. S. Ermentrout, Esq., now a convert to the Catholic church, whose scholarly acquirements and intellectual gifts, combined with rare modesty, are known to many in this Diocese. It is not saying too much for Mr. Forney, that he filled the pulpit formerly occupied by these gentlemen with entire satisfaction to the members of the congregation. A few months ago he was elected Secretary of the Classis (a term equivalent to “Conference,” as used by the Methodists), of which he was a member; and about ten days ago he was elected by the Alumni of Franklin and Marshall College to deliver the Alumni oration at their annual meeting—an honor usually conferred on the older graduates of the college.

“Mr. Forney has had the subjects involved in the conflict between Catholicity and Protestantism under consideration for several years, but only lately received the gift of divine faith. When he became conscious of a clear and definite conviction, he at once gave up his congregation and left Norristown, with a view to freeing himself from the distractions to which he would necessarily have been there subject, and visited Churchville, Berks county, Pa., for the purpose of making a retreat in that secluded and quiet spot, under the direction of the Venerable Father Augustin Bally, S. J. After the conclusion of his retreat, on Sunday morning last, Mr. Forney made his abjuration of Protestantism and his solemn profession of the true faith. He was baptized (sub-conditione) by Father Bally, S. J., assisted by Rev. John P. M. Schleuter, S. J., of the church of the Blessed Sacrament, Churchville, and Rev. Daniel J. McDermott, of St. John's, Philadelphia. There were present, besides a number of the members of the church of the Blessed Sacrament, Prof. C. H. Budd, M.D., and George Dering Wolff, personal friends of Mr. Forney, the latter of whom was his sponsor.

“We heartily congratulate Mr. Forney that his doubts and struggles for light in regard to the true faith are happily ended; and that, in the great and abounding mercy of God, he has been led forward until he has found certainty and peace in the guidance and loving embrace of our Holy Mother, the church. To the members of his late congregation, who esteemed him so highly for his consistency, his earnestness and his piety, and who accepted as true his forcible expositions of principles, which find their legitimate, practical conclusion only

in the bosom of Catholicity, his action—involving, as it does, the sundering of the most tender ties, the sacrifice of valued friendships, of a high clerical position, of reputation, of bright worldly prospects and of other considerations which we are not at liberty even to refer to—ought to speak most loudly. It calls them, with a divine voice louder than human words could, to follow him into the bosom of the church, whose divine institution, unity, perpetuity and authority he has often set forth in his sermons. His friends, too, in the Protestant ministry, of the same theological school with himself, who hold, intellectually, the same ideas which, under God, led him forward, may well lay his action to heart, and ask themselves whether God is not speaking to them, through him, and calling upon them to ‘go and do likewise.’ Many of them, we are sure, see the rottenness of the Protestant platform on which they stand. *Many of them preach truths that can only find their practical fulfillment in the Catholic church.* And yet their position as Protestant ministers, and their action in ascending Protestant pulpits, *give the direct lie* (pardon the harsh word) *to what they preach respecting the divine character and perpetuity of the church, its apostolicity, its divine authority, and the divine efficacy and power of its Sacraments. They have no faith in Protestantism. They cannot.* For they know that it has no certitude and can furnish none to its adherents. And there can be no faith in what is in its own nature uncertain, and which leads its followers only into uncertainty. They know this, and yet in every action they perform as Protestant ministers—nay, every moment that they allow their fellowmen to regard them as ministers—they proclaim in deeds which speak louder than words, their confidence in a system which, in their hearts, many of them doubt and others entirely disbelieve.

*“How they can continue in this self-contradictory course; how they can introduce members by their counterfeit form of the holy Sacrament of Confirmation into a religious system of whose truth they themselves have doubts, and which, with more or less clearness, some of them are convinced is false, schismatic and heretical; how they can professedly discharge the functions of a ministry which some of them are not satisfied is apostolical, and which others positively know to be not apostolical; how they can go through the ceremony of the Protestant imitation and travesty of the Holy Communion, is more than we can understand. We recall this last word.*

*“We can understand it, and yet we cannot.* For we acknowledge, with shame and confusion, that we were once guilty of the same inconsistency and self-contradiction. May God have mercy on us and them, and bring them, as we trust He has us, to true contrition and penitence; and may He bring them—as we know and rejoice He has brought us—to the light and peace which only can be found by submission to the true church; the church founded on the rock; the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman church, which, anchored on Peter, has continued, for nineteen centuries, unmoved and immovable, unchanged and unchangeable, amid the conflicts of human opinions, the surgings of human passions, the changes of human institutions, the origin and rise, the downfall and entire passing away of nations, peoples, dynasties and kingdoms; and which, amid the rage of hell and the enmity of the world, continu-

ally renews its youth, and increases in vigor and in strength. Let not our Protestant friends, whom we still love, and upon whom we look with a longing, yearning heart, though the ties of association and friendship that once bound us closely together are broken, think that we speak unfeelingly, because we speak plainly. Let them not think that we are insensible to the painful struggle through which they must pass, or the sacrifices they must make, in following the leadings of divine truth. We know them. For we have passed through them. But though the immediate experience be bitter as gall, in the end it will be unspeakably sweet. They will receive a hundred-fold more than they give up. This is not our poor word, but that of our Divine Lord: 'Amen, I say to you, there is no man who hath left house or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or children, or lands, for My sake and for the gospel, who shall not receive a hundred times as much, now in this time, . . . with persecutions, and in the world to come life everlasting.' 'Blessed shall you be when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of Man's sake. Be glad in that day, and rejoice: for, behold, great is your reward in heaven.'

"To some it may seem strange that persons, intellectually gifted, learned, in many respects self-denying and pious, possessing many admirable virtues, should remain in so self-contradictory a position as that which we have described. It may seem strange that they should hold and proclaim truths which, under divine grace, lead others forward into the true church, and yet they themselves remain without. The answer is plain; there is nothing strange about it. *Faith* is the *gift of God*. Intellectual convictions, logical conclusions, human knowledge and learning do not constitute faith. They amount to nothing without divine grace. Men, of just and sound ideas intellectually, may serve—as do, we often think, our non-Catholic quondam teachers, and still friends, we trust, of the Mercersburg and Lancaster school—as guide-posts, ever pointing out the 'road to Rome,' but never moving forward one step themselves; not *able* to move forward, for they have not the divine help by which alone they can move towards the right road and walk therein. 'Without Me,' our Saviour says, 'ye can do nothing.' And without Him and His grace, our Mercersburg and Lancaster friends may be (as they have been) used instrumentally and against their own wills to prepare others, and, to a certain extent, to direct them onward into the enjoyment of blessings, in which they themselves shall not participate. May God give them grace and light and strength, that they may follow those whom, according to all human probability, it might have been supposed they would precede into the loving embrace of our Holy Mother, the Church; and may He thus enable them to share the certitude, the peace, the blessedness, in which, under God, through their instrumentality, unintentional though it may have been, others, far their inferiors in every respect, now rejoice."

---

THE Old Catholics propose to appoint two bishops, one for North and the other for South Germany.



ANOTHER VICTIM OF NEVINISM.

ON Wednesday evening, July 2, E. O. Forney, pastor of the first Reformed church of Norristown, formally notified the congregation that his conscience constrained him to join the Roman Catholic church, and accordingly resign his office as their pastor. The announcement took the people generally by surprise, and naturally enough caused great and painful dismay. A few of the leading members had some apprehension of the calamity, excited, probably, by what they knew of Mr. Forney's favorite books, and his intimacy with persons connected or strongly sympathizing with the Romish church. Such seemed, however, to indulge the hope, either that Mr. F. would do what many others holding like sentiments may be doing, continue his relation to the Reformed church notwithstanding his Romish views and preferences; or that he would quietly withdraw from the active duties of the ministry before taking the final steps of apostasy. In this hope they were disappointed. Yielding to the violence of his inward struggle, Mr. F. was himself, as it seems, *precipitated* from the cliff to which he had been driven, and shocked even his most intimate parishioners by the suddenness of his fall.

In every view this fall is a sad one. The parents and nearer relatives of the deluded young man are known to us personally; some of them were among our esteemed former parishioners in Waynesboro; and many are earnest and devoted members of the Reformed church. He was a native, we believe, of Hanover, where his father and family still reside, as active members of the Rev. Dr. Zieber's congregation. He was born, baptized, reared and confirmed in the Reformed church, and gave promise of becoming one of the most acceptable and efficient of its ministers. Such a man should not have become a Papist.

On being sent to the Institutions at Lancaster, to prepare himself by a full course of study for the ministry, his talents soon enabled him to secure a high standing for scholarship, and he is said to have taken the first honor of his class. By the excellence of his personal character, he won general confidence and esteem, and the special regard of the more zealous disciples of Nevinism, or the high-church, ritualistic party, the tenets of whose theory he was known to have eagerly imbibed, or warmly embraced. They regarded him as one of their brightest ornaments, and

expected him to become one of their ablest representatives and emissaries.

Proof of all this was given but a month ago. During the recent Commencement week at Lancaster, he was chosen primarius Orator by the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall College, for next year, in preference to a number of gentlemen of older classes. This was a marked distinction to be conferred upon so comparatively young a man, and showed the high estimate set upon him both as a scholar, and as a disciple of the theological and ecclesiastical party to which he openly belonged. For such honors and favors are not conferred by that party without a reason. They know their men.

That Mr. F. was a decided, avowed adherent of the New-order party was, of course, well understood. The Faculty and their friends assembled in Lancaster, knew their man, so far at least as to feel quite sure that he unreservedly accepted and advocated their peculiar views in regard to doctrine and cultus as his creed. They also knew him well enough to be convinced that he held that creed, with all it involved, intelligently. Very likely they hoped that his conscience would allow him to do this, as theirs does them, without following the creed to its legitimate, logical consequences, by going *openly over* to the Romish church. In this his honesty may have disappointed them, and the effects of his course may cause them vexation and chagrin. It necessarily reveals not only the weakness, but still worse features, of their system or their scheme. Such apostasies of Nevinite disciples as have been occurring of late, seem to be very annoying to the leaders. Probably they are thought premature. They are like the firing of muskets by incautious soldiers, which betray the movements of the army, or the situation of the camp.

Our personal acquaintance with Mr. Forney has been brief, and limited to the short period during which he was a member of the Classis of Philadelphia, and to but the few opportunities when we met at annual or special sessions of the Classis. In a merely personal respect he made a pleasant impression upon us, which deepened with a nearer knowledge of him. He was unmistakably a Nevinite, out and out, and never attempted to conceal it. But he was gentlemanly, courteous, and, above all, candid. He never pretended, to our knowledge, to defend his party or its distinctive doctrines against the charge of their being un-Protestant

or anti-Reformed. He seemed to be sincere, and we are willing to believe he was sincere and conscientious in holding his opinions, and probably tried to think that as his teachers held those opinions and yet remained in the Reformed church, he might do so too. Possibly, also, he hoped, as others seem to hope, that by continuing with those whose views he held in the Reformed church, and zealously working with them in a common cause, the church itself might be revolutionized into conformity with the schemes and dogmas of his school.

Altogether, he seemed to us to be a young man who was too intelligent not to be aware of the utter inconsistency of his views with evangelical Reformed Protestantism, too frank to try by sophistry or prevarication to cover or mask his sense of that inconsistency, and too honorable or conscientious to remain, for any selfish consideration, in a church whose distinctive doctrines he inwardly rejected, and whose historical character and claims he had ceased to respect.

This estimate of him the editor of the *Messenger* and some others may not be able to appreciate. Their standard of judging men in these days seems to differ from ours. Some years' experience, especially of late, has led us to set a high value upon a measure of candor which will endure no deceptive evasions, ambiguities, false pretenses, or concealments ; upon a degree of self-sacrificing devotion to convictions, or the dictates of conscience, which will shrink from no loss of emoluments of office, of position, power, or earthly reputation ; and upon a fidelity to solemn vows and oaths which would rather die than circumvent or violate them.

Men that would rather be right than be rich, "rather be right than be President," rather be right than live, are the men now most needed by the church, as well as by the State.

We cannot agree, therefore, with Dr. Fisher in the *Messenger*, in denouncing Mr. Forney, as he also did other defectants before him, for acting according to their honest convictions. Their course is open to severe censure and condemnation. The step they have taken has plunged them, we believe, into fatal consequences. That they have been led blindly into the ditch will not make the ditch less dark or miry, though they may mistake its mud for a bed of down, or dream that its darkness is light.

But having allowed their intellects to be filled with false doc-



trines inculcated, their hearts to be ensnared by the deceitfulness of errors commended and defended, and their consciences to be perverted and spoiled, what were they to do? If, as they say, they had often been told, or led to believe, that Romanism was nearer the truth than Protestantism on many, if not most essential points, could they help going to Rome? If their confidence in the faith of their fathers was shaken, and they felt, or imagined, that the ground was giving way beneath their feet, whilst the finger which they had taken for their guide pointed to what seemed, or was represented to be, a rock in the ocean, why should they not leap and try to reach that rock?

A man must be true to his conscience, even though its voice be that of Satan in the disguise of an angel. And just here lies the fearfulness of having a false conscience, and the terrible responsibility of those by whom the very consciences of men may be perverted. To be under the bondage of a conscience which holds the *truth* in unrighteousness, *believing a lie*, is the dreadful penalty of "giving heed to profane and vain babblings," and of following servilely "vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision," instead of abiding firmly and meekly by "the words of faith, and good doctrine of the truth, as it is in Jesus," to which, by grace, they had previously attained.

The great mistake of Mr. F. and those who preceded him in the fearful apostasy, lies back of the formal act. A man who dies of poison is most guilty, not for dying, but for having taken the poison which killed him. Mr. F. and his associates may indeed say: The poison was put into our food; it was given to us by those on whom we were led to rely for good and wholesome nourishment. In this way they may seek to excuse themselves, even on our supposition of their case.

But we answer, you took the dish, you ate the broth, with your eyes open. You were fairly warned. You knew that what you were taking in was *not* the faith of your church. Or if, at first, you may have been deceived for a time, as others were, in regard to the matter, you had opportunity of correcting the mistake before it was too late. You cannot plead that you were not told that "there was death in the pot," in time to have escaped the fatal issue.

They are without excuse. If they are ignorant of the iniquitously apostate character of Popery, they are "willfully ignorant"

of it. They once knew, and might know to-day, if they would, that Romish Popery has proven itself by a history of more than a thousand years to be the mystery of iniquity, the mother of abominations, the teacher of doctrines contradictory of each other, and so utterly contradictory of the Word of God, the Gospel of Jesus Christ, that it must forbid the people reading the Gospel for themselves (wherever it dare forbid this), or require them under awful threats to read them only through the glasses of the Pope. They have known, and might know, that the Romish Popery of to-day is, with its accursed idolatries and pernicious principles, the same, essentially, it has ever been.

Rome and the Pope may perform many lying wonders; but they cannot undo past facts, or roll back the history of centuries. No matter what pen writes history, facts remain, and cannot be erased, amended, or undone.

Sadly, however, as we deplore the suicidal folly of these former brethren, and unequivocally as we must condemn their conduct, we cannot stop with them or here.

*Who slew all these?* By what hand or hands was the poison of which they died administered?

Who led them to the brow of the precipice, down which they have plunged into spiritual darkness and ruin?

These are proper and natural questions. They should be asked and honestly answered by every minister and member of the church.

Why should we do as Dr. Fisher, for instance, has done in the *Messenger*, lie down cautiously on the cliff over which they have tumbled, and cry to them as they struggle among the reefs or billows beneath: You fools, why did you go so *very near the edge*? Why did you risk such a fall, and give me, and Lancaster, and your other companions up here, so much annoyance and trouble, in compelling us to make up all sorts of apologies for the calamity? Why could you not have done as I am doing, walk with the rank and file, but keep a rod or so off from the perilous cone? Or if, like some others, your zeal did drive you so far out, why not have done as they do, keep your bodies, at least, tied by a gold or silken cord, three-ply, to the fruitful vine or fig tree planted by kindly hands on the sunny side of the hill?

All such anathemas and lamentations now are useless and vain. Let the dead bury their dead—unless, indeed, you have some

means, some Elijah's or apostle's raiment, with which to touch and to reclaim them.

But *let those still living be looked after*. Instead of abandoning them, as heathen abandon their sick to get rid of the trouble of caring for them; instead of saying to them, as the *Messenger*, provoked by the humiliating necessity of *publishing another case*, says: Oh, that if there are any more like them, they would go and be done with it, and cease putting us into such straits for explanations and apologies for these frequent apostasies. Instead of doing this, why not rather try to catch the falling, and help the sick, and restore the lame and the halt, as the Lord of the prophets told the priests of olden times to do?

Above all—why not look after the causes of these apostasies? We have pointed out what we believe to be the chief causes. The Classis of Philadelphia did so more than a year ago, in a report which Dr. Fisher refused to publish, lest it might reveal unpleasant secrets to his readers.

One of the defectants, Mr. Wolff, as may be seen in the article of the *Catholic Standard* which our readers will find in the present number of the MONTHLY, tells plainly how he was led towards Rome. He confirms our convictions and statements.

We believe, and have said, that the primal cause or occasion lies with those who are teaching Romish or semi-Romish and anti-Protestant doctrines in our church, and who have means of exerting great influence over young men preparing for the ministry. Either this is the cause, or it must lie somewhere else.

Shall it not be searched out! Suppose the search *should* lead to some chair or hearth it might be felt delicate to disturb. What then? Is a man, or are any three or five men, to be held of more account than the purity, the peace and the life, of our beloved church, and the safety of immortal souls? Alas! may not manolatry be our ruin?

We have an Eastern Synod. Let it faithfully institute the search, until the evil be discovered.

We had a Board of Visitors. Are they alive and well? Have they heard that six graduates of their theological school, some of the most promising, have gone almost directly through the halls of that school to Rome, and say that they learned the way to Rome, and received the first strong impulse to go to Rome, in those halls?



Dr. Fisher is good on the scent. At least he thought so when, in "his honest zeal for the good of the church," he thought, in 1867-8, he was scenting us into a certain publication office in New York, and hoped to bring us to certain execution at the Synod of Hagerstown, for being, as he surmised, the author of certain statements regarding Mercersburg theology, which an upright Mercersburg disciple said were true.

Might not Dr. Fisher do the church good service by searching out and exposing, honestly and fairly, and without equivocation, the prime guilty cause of these apostasies?

Oh! that some one of his party would do it, and that right soon. If the Eastern Synod will not; if the Board of Visitors will not; if Dr. Fisher and the *Messenger* will not; then, by all that is precious in our holy apostolic faith; by all that is dear and sacred in the memories of the past; and by all that is worth preserving in the things that yet remain, we implore *the church* itself, Elders and members, to wake up to the emergency, and save us from being utterly and forever wrecked.

---

#### BISMARCK AND THE CLERGY.

THE "Clergy Regulations Bill" was passed in the Upper House of the Prussian Diet, on the 1st of May. It is a stringent law, and will effectively subordinate the Romish, as well as all other clerical authority, to the power of the State. Of course, the Romanists cry out against the measure; but their own misdeeds have rendered it necessary. The plots of the Jesuits were proved, by the government, to be dangerous to the laws. If we admit Mr. Froude's theory, that the Jesuits are, *de facto*, a secular or political body, under the assumption of an ecclesiastical character, then the German Government cannot be impugned for its severity toward them. As to the other Papal ecclesiastics, their adhesion to the late decrees of Rome is practical disloyalty, not to say treason, to the German nationality, and the government is right in disabling them to do mischief to the laws and the liberties of its citizens. The bishops have attempted to displace Catholics who would not acknowledge the new Roman dogmas, from State educational institutions, pulpits, etc. The government, by the new laws, puts bishops and all under its supreme control, in these,

as in other matters ; and it does what is both right and necessary in its circumstances.

In its circumstances, we say. The criticisms in England and this country on Bismarck's policy have been mostly one-sided and fallacious. It has been represented as a revival of the old intolerance—as an interference with the rights of conscience. It is not at all obnoxious to this criticism. It is simply a policy of tolerance and protection of the freedom of conscience of Prussian subjects, against the power of Rome, exercised by her prelates in Germany. The idea that it is wrong for governments to interfere with ecclesiastical affairs is abstractly right. It is the very basis of our own policy toward religion ; but it cannot apply in nations where church and State are still united. Prussia, Italy, Spain, etc., are in this condition ; the church is a part of the government ; the church estates are part of the national property. They are, therefore, legitimately subject to the legislation of the State. There is but one logical criticism that we, as Americans, can make on the policy of these nations. It is, that their fundamental blunder is in still maintaining the incompatible union of church and State. They will be in a quagmire of embarrassments till they resolutely enfranchise the church by divorcing it.

They begin to see this truth. Public opinion is beginning to favor it all over western Europe. Our own national example has been quietly but powerfully leavening European sentiment. We doubt that there is now a prominent statesman in the cabinets of western Europe who does not receive, in theory at least, Cavour's maxim of "a free church in a free State." They only wait their opportunity for its practical adoption ; and many of them long for that opportunity as a deliverance from infinite perplexities. The opportunity, we think, is not far off. The *Diritto*, a leading journal of Italy, calls upon its government to admit, at once, "religious democracy," by making the appointment of all parish priests elective by the people. Italy cannot much longer endure her anomalous relations to the perverse Vatican court. Her best policy will soon be, to lay the axe to the root of the tree—the old, decayed upas, which has overshadowed and poisoned Europe for a thousand years. If Italy do so, under the very eyes of the Pope, other States will promptly follow her example. Such a revolution would be the prelude of the emancipation of Europe in almost every other respect.—*Methodist*.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

### MODERN SCIENCE.

THE following address by J. A. Foil, of North Carolina, is one of those delivered by the graduating class at our late Commencement:

The history of the past investigations, discoveries and developments in general science, is peculiarly interesting to the modern scientific student. He follows it up through its many different progressive stages, but he soon perceives the comparative insignificance of all past progress in science, when he sees some of its wonderful strides in the present age. Mighty intellects, fired by an unabating enthusiasm, have of late penetrated the depths and scaled the heights, and thus made discoveries of which their ancestors never dreamed. Geology has shown that the earth, as the habitation of man, is only a speck in an infinity of *time*. Astronomy has shown that the planet which we inhabit is but a speck in an infinity of *space*. As the latter science has shown that we are nothing in a surrounding universe, the former shows that "we are nothing in the elapsed organic antiquity during which the earth has existed, and has been the abode of life," in its various forms of progress. Time will not permit us to consider the development of each particular science, for the field is as boundless as the universe itself; and numerous as wonderful are the recent discoveries. The modern invention of the single scientific instrument called the spectroscope has presented to our view a new world of intelligence. It has come upon us like a meteor; and the suddenness of the revolution which it has created in the scientific mind of Europe has probably been unparalleled in any other age. When the powerful telescope failed, this little instrument took its place. By *it* the astronomer penetrates the starry heavens, there to seize, hold, analyze and define the metallic or gaseous composition of these hitherto inaccessible bodies,



marking and numbering their elements and constituents as accurately as the apothecary marks his drugs, or the mineralogist his specimens. But whither are we tending? To what unknown haven are these wonderful revelations of the physical universe wafting us? Ere long we may expect to lay aside our old textbooks, and learn anew the alphabet of science; but are we to believe that the fundamental principles of our most holy religion are jeopardized by such advancement in the knowledge of nature's undisputed laws? None but those who fail to recognize as axiomatic that truth must not contradict itself, but be consistent, have the least apprehensions. Science which is *untrue*, is *no* science. When properly understood, it not only ceases to engender skepticism and beget cavils, but becomes corroborative of the truths of divine revelation. "In proportion as the system of nature is minutely explored, and the physical sciences in general approximate to perfection, the more striking appears the coincidence between the revelations of the Bible and the revelations of nature."

However, there is a class of scientists who are zealously advocating theories manifestly at variance with the generally admitted truths of the Bible. One of these theories, which would have us reject the simple Bible account of the creation of man and animals about six thousand years ago, is boldly maintained by Mr. Darwin, the celebrated English naturalist. At first his strange doctrine was rejected with indignation by the scientific world; but now it is gaining an influence which is at once wide-spread and imposing. His doctrine, is "that a primordial germ, with no inherent intelligence, develops under purely natural influences into all the infinite variety of vegetable and animal organisms, with all their complicated relations to each other and the world around them." He maintains that there is no intervention of mind in the whole process, but that God only created the unintelligent cell, or "primordial germ," which, by a natural process, has developed into all the forms of life which we now find in the world. To all who are not materialistic, this theory is manifestly absurd, because "it is founded upon the assumption of an impossibility." It makes matter do the work of *mind*. It refers to mere natural causes what we firmly believe to be due to the operations of a divine mind.

Closely allied to this is the so-called "Protoplasmic Theory"

advocated by Prof. Huxley, according to which he endeavors to account for the phenomena of life. By protoplasm he means the matter of life itself, or such matter as exhibits life. He holds that the only difference between inorganic dead matter, and that composing living plants and animals, including man, is in the manner in which the atoms of such matter are aggregated. To illustrate, he says: "Carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen are all lifeless bodies. Of these, carbon and oxygen unite in certain proportions, and under certain conditions give rise to carbonic acid; hydrogen and oxygen produce water; nitrogen and hydrogen give rise to ammonia. These new compounds, like the elementary bodies of which they are composed, are lifeless. But when they are brought together under certain conditions, they give rise to the still more complex body, protoplasm, and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena of life."

This theory also is thoroughly *materialistic*, because its champion advocates thus endeavor to explain not only life in its simplicity, but also all our mental or psychological operations. They blot out the soul and ignore the existence of an intelligent supermundane deity. From this fact the theory is easily overthrown. Men who deny the objective existence of mind or spirit, can no more think, speak or write, than an idealist can *act* without recognizing the existence of external matter. Any theory, therefore, which contradicts our self-consciousness is necessarily absurd, and must be rejected.

With such exceptions as the theories just considered, science, in its onward march, spreading the light of truth among men, raises them out of the cess-pools of ignorance and superstition, and places them in a new atmosphere of intelligence, in which they are enabled rightly to appreciate the revealed truths of the Bible. Science and religion, the hitherto seemingly antagonistic principles, are daily becoming more and more reconciled. Modern philosophers, whose intellects are illumined from the chandelier of divine truth, are gradually discovering the true value of science. Often when a new discovery is made in science which would teach us that we have misinterpreted some portion of Scripture, it is taken advantage of by infidels, who give it a mighty *impulse*. It then rushes through the great, dark wilderness of thought, like an irresistible storm, and the world is astonished by the crashing of the tall trees as it sweeps on, threatening soon to demolish the

whole fabric of religion. But when truth arises and says, "Peace, be still," the storm, obeying the command, subsides into a gentle calm, and then we see that it has only uprooted some abominable superstition which we had always regarded as an embodiment of truth.

All true and unbiased Christians will ever honor the investigations of science; for it often accomplished what *they* are unable to do. By its narrow superstitions and prejudicial ideas of the Bible are overthrown. Then why should we fear science? When *true*, it not only ceases to be an enemy, but meets revelation with a smiling face. The timorous Christian who refuses to meet the false scientists in battle array, says, "Let them alone—they cannot injure us;" but he soon sees his mistake.

The high-churchman says, "Keep the people in ignorance." He knows full well that science will burst asunder the shackles of superstition which he is anxious to propagate among them. He would draw over them the dark curtain of his high-church despotism, through which not a ray of the sun of science can penetrate. Science must not be opposed by those who are unable to distinguish between the true and the false. Hence it becomes necessary for those who would enter the field of controversy to make thorough investigations, and by so doing advance the cause of religion. True science must ever be the hand-maiden of Christianity. Then let us welcome truth from whatever source it may come; for all truth is one and of God, and is necessarily consistent, whether it is revealed by the phenomena of nature or through the words of inspiration.

---

#### THE URSINUS UNION OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

No recent movement in the Reformed church for the maintenance of its proper historical life and genius, seems to us to be more promising and hopeful than the formation of the *Ursinus Union* at the recent Commencement at the college, with its comprehensive plan, and especially since it was adopted with such great unanimity, and has such a goodly array of warm and devoted friends. The recent sad defection of Rev. Edward O. Forney to



the petrified corruptions of Popery, must convince every one that there was a loud call for the formation of just such an association, with the single aim in view of preserving the honorable past record of the Reformed church, and transmitting to posterity its precious heir-looms of the past.

So long as the official authorities of the church make no earnest efforts to stay the devastating flood that has been pouring over the fair plains of our Zion for years, leaving comparative desolation in its track, the only refuge of the true and sincere friends of the church is in a voluntary association to stand up, with heart, voice, effort and prayer, for the faith once delivered to the saints.

The times are hopeful and auspicious for such efforts. The recent throwing off of the mask by so many of the adherents of the New-order, and their unblushing acceptance of all the follies of Popery, has opened the eyes of a great many who previously could not possibly believe that there was any danger in the Mercersburg movement. When at the Dayton General Synod, in 1866, it was urged by fair argument that the general tendency of the New-order, and its underlying theological principles, could be none else than to land many in the arms of Rome, that statement was ridiculed with more or less confidence, and with some success. Then only one minister had gone over to Rome; and in his case (Stewart) the matter was supposed to be readily explained by some peculiarities in his character.

But when others, one by one, standing high in the regards of the new sect, successively proclaimed their true sentiments by a formal abjuration of Protestantism; when Wolff, and Ermentrout, and Wagner, and Budd, and Forney, came forth full-bloom Papists (to say nothing of Geisy, Wartman, &c.)—it became plain that there must be something in all this. There must be a fault somewhere. Somewhere there must be something rotten in Denmark. The matter can now no longer be smothered or suppressed by authority. The people will talk and have their opinions on the subject. They don't want their children to be transformed into Papists or semi-Papists. They don't want their funds to be devoted to the perversion of young and susceptible minds.

In consequence of this we now find a wide-spread awakeness on this subject, a readiness on the part of many to act at once, and decisively.

We like this *voluntary* association. It springs from the heart and from thorough conviction. Such associations have been wonderfully favored and blest from on high in the past history of the church. All the theological schools in the early church sprang from such voluntary associations. When the Pharisees and the official authorities of the Jewish church refused to purify their church, and were only intent upon carrying out their authoritative schemes and petrified maxims, it was the voluntary association of Jesus and his disciples which started the movement that ground the Jewish state and church into powder, and brought life and immortality home to the experience of thousands.

In our judgment, it needs only that the *Ursinus Union* be now vigorously supported and carried forward, to make it an inestimable blessing to the Reformed church. Having no selfish objects in view, no temptation for mere talk, self-display and eccentricity of views, it opens the way for *real work*, and work *that will tell on the future of the Reformed church in the United States.*

HEIDELBERG.

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

*All the young men* (five in number) sent forth a month ago from our *Theological Department*, and licensed by the Classis of Philadelphia, have been eagerly sought up, and are either already settled or about to locate. *M. S. Fritsch* was called by several congregations in the vicinity of Reading, Pa. \* *J. A. Foil* has located in Newton, North Carolina, as an associate professor with the Rev. J. C. Clapp, President of Catawba College, and pastor of an adjacent charge. *F. F. Bahner* was unanimously elected by the Milton Reformed congregation, as successor to their able and esteemed pastor, Rev. S. H. Reid. Mr. Bahner will probably accept, or may have already accepted the call. Mr. *Seiple*, according to our latest information, expects to supply, for a time, the New Berlin charge. And *R. Rahauser* has been invited to an interesting field in York county. It is very gratifying to find our young men so warmly appreciated and in such demand. If we had ten more ready for service, there are as many places where they would

be cordially welcomed. And one of the most cheering considerations in their case is, that they enter their several fields with a fair understanding of the doctrines and principles they hold, and intend to maintain and preach. They needed not to conceal their real sentiments in regard either to faith or practice in order to secure an election. This being so, they can labor with much greater freedom and satisfaction than if they had directly or indirectly deceived the people, and were conscious of having done so for the purpose of getting a place. Only let them see to it that they preserve their integrity in this respect, by continuing steadfast in the faith and walking worthy of their high calling.

*Successful efforts.* Two weeks of the present vacation have been spent by us in hasty visits among a few friends in different places in the interior of the State. Every where the cause of Ursinus College was cordially welcomed. As its character and purpose get to be more fully understood, the number of its friends multiply and their interest in it increases. In proof of this, we received every where words of encouragement. All said: we rejoice in the establishment and success of the Institution, and believe that, under the blessing of God, it will be the means of saving our church from being ruined by error, and of having it fixed more firmly than ever upon the foundation of the old evangelical faith.

But they did more than give words of cheer and assurances of sympathy and prayer. Such as were able also gave their money. In the course of our trip, which extended from Lancaster up into Huntingdon county, we appealed to *twelve* friends (only to twelve), and obtained in subscriptions and cash, \$1235. Of this amount \$800, including \$200 in cash, were obtained in Lancaster, Pa., (\$600 in St. Paul's Reformed church, Rev. J. B. Shumaker, pastor.) This was in addition to \$1400 previously secured in Lancaster and the immediate vicinity. In Harrisburg fifteen dollars were unexpectedly, and without our personal solicitation, handed to us from a lady, for the cause of beneficial education in Ursinus. Further on, an aged, earnest father in Israel, put twenty dollars into our hands (without solicitation) as a slight foretoken of something much better to come. Afterwards, brother Kennedy, in Alexandria, Pa., very promptly and cheerfully responded to a brief and simple appeal by subscribing \$200, and father *Joseph Isenberg*, a staunch, intelligent old member of



the church, and firm adherent to the old faith, residing with his faithful and zealous daughter, amidst the retirement of fertile hills in *Canoe Valley*, subscribed \$200 for the present. Had time and other engagements, and above all the absolute need of taking a season of rest before the vacation passes, allowed of our making other calls and appeals, there is every reason to believe that the amount obtained in this short and necessarily hasty trip, might have been more than doubled. Indeed, \$500 more were virtually secured, to say nothing of promises made by brethren, whose word may be considered as good as gold. A chief hindrance in the way of obtaining money for Ursinus, is one of which it is unpleasant to speak, namely, the fact that so many friends who have heretofore been liberal in giving to such objects, feel that their money has been abused and their confidence betrayed. This has created a feeling of mistrust. And it is only when they see that so far as explicit written pledges and covenant bonds can make things secure, they have been and are so secured, that they can bring themselves to "try it again."

*All subscriptions and donations to Ursinus College are sought and obtained under a solemn written guarantee and bond, that the faith and religious usages of the Institutions shall be strictly and honestly those of the Evangelical Reformed church, as laid down in the doctrinal standards of the church, taken in their fair historical sense. Any departure from this, either in the direction of Popery, semi-Popery, or high-churchism on the one side, or of infidelity on the other side, will forfeit the charter, property and donations of the College, and entitle the donors or their heirs, to reclaim what has been given.*

The directors and friends of the College wish this to be most distinctly understood. They desire neither to sail under false colors nor to obtain a single dime under false pretences.

To the above it is also gratifying to state, that the agent of the College has met with corresponding success in another field, having thus far obtained about one thousand dollars. This has been done, too, notwithstanding the disadvantage of calls made upon friends engaged in the labors of the harvest field.

In addition to these cheering pecuniary results, others equally important, or of even greater account, have been secured in the way of getting young men to resolve to enter the College with the purpose of preparing themselves for the ministry. Several have

been met who sought information on this point, and who have determined to enter the Institution at the opening of the next term, September 1st, (Monday.) No better evidence could be had of the favor of the Lord upon our cause. Much as there is in the unhappy condition of the church to discourage young men from entering our ministry, the Lord is still constraining many to do so. The apostasies to Rome, in consequence of the injurious educational influences at work among us, might be supposed to cast a dark shadow over the church, which would frighten most persons, and deter them from enlisting in such a conflict. But when the spirit of the Lord lifts up the standard against enemies that come in like a flood, He can also move and nerve hearts to rally around that standard.

The cause of Evangelical Christianity in the church of our fathers, though it has been made to suffer much, is by no means lost. And there are indications of growing brightness that it will not be allowed to go down into the whirlpool which has opened in our midst.

*The Fall Term* of the College will open on *Monday, September 1st*. Let all who expect to enter, be promptly on hand. An opening sermon for the new College year, corresponding to the Baccalaureate at its close, will be preached by a member of the Faculty. Applications for admission should be made early to us, or any other member of the Faculty. See advertisement.

*The Ursinus Union*.—In accordance with the action of the Union at its meeting in Freeland during Commencement week, the following committees of the several departments have been appointed:

1. *College Aid Department*—Revs. E. H. Nevin, D.D., Wm. A. Helffrich, D.D., Wm. Hendrickson, Wm. Sorber, and Judge H. C. Hoover, A. L. Kaub and Geo. Schall.

2. *Educational Aid* (or Benef. Ed.)—Rev. G. Wolff, J. H. A. Bomberger, Prof. H. W. Super, Rev. M. Rowland, and H. W. Kratz, Esq., J. Wiest and Immanuel Kelker.

3. *Church Aid*—Revs. F. W. Kremer, D.D., Daniel Ziegler, D.D., E. H. Fogel, L. K. Derr, and Judge J. Coover, J. L. Lemberger and David Dunn.

4. *Publication*—Revs. H. H. W. Hibshman, J. B. Shumaker,

S. H. Reid, A. B. Shenkle, and J. H. Pearsol, Chas. Denues, Esq., and J. Follmer.

Each committee will select its own chairman, secretary, and, if thought proper, sub-treasurer. The person first named on each committee will call an early meeting of its members for organization. When once duly organized, the Union in its several departments can work efficiently in cōoperation with each other for the important objects contemplated. It is believed that the plan of work will be found as effective as it is simple. Three members of each committee are to constitute a quorum, fully empowered to transact the business of the department. All that is needed is prompt, vigorous and well-matured action.

---

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*The items* under this head, for the present number, must necessarily be *hurry-graphs*, taken on the wing. We are, at this particular moment, writing in the august presence, geographically, of that grand old ridge known as *Tussy's* mountain, and nearly opposite a point of it, about ten miles from where our anxious friend of the "Mittelmass" paper may guess we are. Would he like to know where that is? Well, all we can answer now is, that we paid our way hither; that we are here *cum privilegio* of the only powers whose authority we consult in such matters; and that it is not Rowan Co., North Carolina. Many friends have kindly, very kindly received us, earnestly pressed us to preach for them, (which we did, with due official consent), and, although it was a week-day evening in the midst of harvest, came in crowds from "many miles around" (no exaggeration, mark, all *literally* true, provided by *many*, you understand, 7 or 8), and were not at all offended at being *kept in* longer than usual. There was, indeed, no joint-consistory meeting of thirty members held afterwards, and no flattering preamble and resolutions complimentary of the *Reformed Church Monthly* and "its able Editor," were passed. There were none prepared that we know of ("we speak the truth, we lie not"), which might have been extemporized, "spontaneously, &c," and passed. But this is true, that a large congregation was out for so short a notice and a week evening, and that many of them declared themselves rather pleased with what was said and done. The text on the occasion was, if any of our friends choose to hunt it up, 1 Timothy 4: 1, one which naturally suggested itself after being asked so often about Mr. Forney's apostasy and the cause of it.

*That apostasy*, by the way, following so closely upon the heels of the others,



has been causing considerable stir. Lancaster-Nevinite apologists seem to be at their wits' tail for some new explanatory excuse. One of the fraternity in Lancaster, whom we take to be the ex-mathematical *incumbent* of a chair in Franklin and Marshall College, coolly comforts himself by saying that it is better for such deluded fellow-disciples to go to Rome than to *the other place*. He seems to mean *hell*, but could not summon the energy necessary to say so. This is a queer, ambiguous sort of consolation. It leaves one to conclude that he admits, that when a young theologian once gets fully within the sweep of the New-order theology he *must go* either to Rome or to that other place. This exactly agrees with what the poor fellows who have gone from Lancaster to Rome assert. Mr. Forney is reported to have said the day before his open apostasy, that in 24 hours he would be either a Roman Catholic or an infidel! And so, in effect, say they all. And, note well, they solemnly declared that for this they are mainly indebted, so far as human agencies are concerned, *to what they were taught and learned at Mercersburg and Lancaster*.

Poor Dr. Fisher in the *Messenger* is utterly perplexed. If only these apostates had all gone at once, he might have dispatched them in a single editorial and be done with the abominable thing. But they keep going one by one at short intervals, and so impose upon him the ugly, hateful task of patching up some new excuse each time. He sees, besides, that there is no getting out of it. Gladly would he pass the whole thing by, pretend not to have heard of it. But there is that *Christian World*, and, still worse, that odious "unauthorized publication," the *Reformed Church Monthly*, which will be sure to blurt out and blow the apostasy if he don't, and set the church all ablaze about it. So he plunges at the case in very desperation. And what has he to say? In the main, two things: First, he says Mr. Forney was poisoned by reading bad Romish books; that's the reason he went to Rome. But one naturally asks how he came to select such books. Dr. Fisher pretty broadly hints that Dr. Schaff is to blame for this. Without undertaking Dr. Schaff's defence (he is able to vindicate himself), we must pronounce it mean and shameful in the *Messenger* to try to screen more guilty parties now in our church, and after whom the Board of Visitors should have looked, whilst an effort is made to put odium upon one who is no longer in connection with our church. Whether the Popish books were ever recommended by Dr. Schaff or not, we can't say. But we do know that they were directly or indirectly commended to students of the Theological Seminary since Dr. S. left it.

This, however, is of comparatively small account. Really there was not much need of the apostates reading avowed Romish books. They had all they needed to make Papists of them, if they read and believed the *Messenger* and the *Mercersburg Review*. Dr. Nevin's articles would suffice in their way. Dr. Gerhart's specious logic on the priestly character of the ministry contained the gist of the Romish doctrine on that point. Dr. T. G. Apple's articles on Fritchel on the Sacraments, contained the substance of the Romish theory on that point, and Dr. Gans on absolution surely went far enough on that point to make a Papist of the muddiest water.

What need had any young men of more specious Popish literature than was

thus put into their hands. Feed a cow on garlic and you get butter to match. Feed a young man on such Popish pasture as grow luxuriantly in the Mercersburg meadows of the *Review* and *Messenger*, and you may well expect a corresponding result.

The *Messenger* should lay hold of this matter more seriously. It might and should know something to say more to the point. O when will it cease its shuffling and temporizing?

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

*A part of* our vacation has been spent in visiting different brethren and helping them in their good work. They have kept us pretty busy, but it was pleasant employment, cheering to us, and we trust not unprofitable to them.

On Sunday, July 13, it was our privilege to assist Brother J. B. Shumaker, pastor of St. Paul's Reformed church, Lancaster, at his summer communion. The services were largely attended, and *nine* were added to the church. Though Brother S. has been located in Lancaster but a short time, the congregation gives cheering signs of revived prosperity. In every department of Christian effort the congregation has wakened up to fresh energy and zeal, and Brother S. has good reason to feel greatly encouraged. For the substantial proofs of interest in Ursinus College, referred to on a previous page, given by members of this congregation, we feel sincerely thankful. From Lancaster our route lay north and west. In Cumberland Valley a day's visit gave fresh assurance of the lively interest felt by faithful members of the church in efforts to maintain and perpetuate her true life and character as Protestant, Evangelical and Reformed. In Perry county our young Brother *Lindaman* was found earnestly prosecuting his work, and with tokens of the divine favor upon his labors which are most cheering. In Blair and Ickesburg the congregations on Sunday, July 20, were large, and the members display warm zeal for the Lord and His truth. Regarding the innovations of high-churchism, but one sentiment seems to prevail, that of most decided opposition to them, whilst, on the other hand, we did not see the least indications of that fanaticism with which some of our congregations, who will not tolerate Nevinism, are sometimes falsely accused. Everywhere it was most manifest, that so far as the new-order or high-church movement is at all known, it causes offence, and is rejected by our people. Even the one or two here and there who are counted favorable to it, show, on a little inquiry, that they have been hoodwinked as to its true character, and deceived. In Huntingdon, town and county, the same holds true. Brother Dole is prospering in his work, and his ministrations are proving very acceptable.

Altogether, the trip was a very pleasant one, and finds us returning with fresh courage for the work still to be done. That much still remains to be done is

well understood. The apostasies from the church, by way of Nevinism to Rome, are in part causing discouragement. This imposes the additional task of counteracting the effect of such discouragement. But each case of apostasy is hastening the final issue, and, we believe, helping to open eyes that were blinded, and to convince the halting of the necessity of immediate and earnest action.

THE following article, received too late for insertion in its proper place, is added here. Another on the same subject, from *Dr. Good*, will appear in *September*.

*The Defection of E. O. Forney.*

The church has no doubt been startled with the sad announcement in the *Reformed Church Messenger* of July 9th, by Rev. Dr. S. R. Fisher, of the defection of E. O. Forney, late of Norristown, Pa., who, like others before him, has gone over to the Roman Catholic church. Mr. Forney was a graduate of Franklin and Marshall College, and studied theology in the Eastern Seminary, and was regarded as a most promising young man. He has only been in the ministry a few years, and has already, in the language of G. D. Wolff, a former pervert, been "received into the loving arms of our holy mother, the church." The *Catholic Standard* states, that he made an abjuration of Protestantism on Sunday, the 6th of July, in the Catholic church at Churchville, Berks county, Pa., at which time he was re-baptized by Rev. Aug. Bally, assisted by several Romish priests, Prof. C. H. Budd and G. D. Wolff being present, the latter of whom was his sponsor.

Facts like the above are exceedingly humiliating to the true friends of the Reformed church. They justly expose us to the reproach of all Protestant churches, for tolerating a system of philosophy and theology, the direct tendency of which is to lead our most promising young men unto the bosom of the Episcopal or Romish church. Where there have been as many perversions as have been within the last few years, it is idle to talk, as our Mercersburg and Lancaster friends have been doing, of the conservative character of their teaching. The common sense of mankind judges of the tree by the fruit it produces. When we look at other institutions, such as Princeton, Yale, New Brunswick, the Union Theological Seminary, &c., we see no such sad defections amongst the young men who have studied there. As there is, therefore, a manifest difference in those who go out from these institutions, from those who go from Lancaster, it is but just to conclude that there must be a decided difference in the doctrines inculcated. There can, in fact, be no other conclusion, and it is high time the church looks at it in its true light.

To say, as Dr. Fisher does, that these defections are to be attributed to the fact that these perverts surround themselves with Catholic literature, and study this more than they do that of their own church, is a miserable evasion of what must be felt to be the true cause, and does not go to the root of the matter. For if it be true, as is thus affirmed, the question naturally arises, why is it that the young men who study at our Eastern Institution surround themselves with such Romish literature even before they leave the Seminary, and are ready in a few



years after their ordination to go over into the Romish church? The same literature can be had by the young men who study in other theological seminaries, and yet we hear no such complaints as are made by Dr. Fisher. Why is this? The true answer must be, that the young men at Lancaster are led, under the teaching they there received, to place a higher estimate upon Romish, than they do upon Protestant literature. And this again must be attributed to the value which their teachers set upon it. If the judgment be not biased or perverted, there can be no danger in the study of the Romish literature. Luther, Zwingli, Melancthon, Calvin, &c., all studied Romish literature, and so do thousands in the present day, with just the very opposite result, being led thereby to see its weakness and rottenness in very many respects, and have become by means of this study to be more fully persuaded of the truth of Protestantism. Protestantism has nothing to fear from the study of Romish literature if both are permitted to stand upon their real merits, and nothing done to prejudice the mind. But when young men hear lecture after lecture, and read article after article in which the weak sides of Protestantism, as they are termed, are pointed out, and now and then hear it said it is a failure, what else are we to expect but that there will be perversions on the part of some, whilst the faith of others will be unsettled. God only knows what conflicts there have been in the church in consequence of such teaching. To our own certain knowledge there have been not a few who have at some time in their ministry been out at sea and hardly knew where they would land.

The case is evidently a serious one—much more so than some are disposed to think. With all the care the *Reformed Messenger* has taken to hunt up and publish the defections that have occurred in other churches, there has been but little comfort in this direction. The simple fact is, there is no part of the Protestant church where there have been such defections as have occurred within the bounds of our Eastern Synod. Nor do we believe such a state of things would be tolerated anywhere else. It is true, resolutions were passed condemning G. D. Wolff for his apostasy. But what force could these have in the eyes of thoughtful persons, when along with this condemnation the institutions where the first seeds were sown were commended to public favor, and the church told that the peculiar doctrines taught therein did in no way contribute to his defections, in the very face of his open declaration to the contrary.

The defection of Forney, Wolff, Ermentrout, Giesy, Wagner, Budd, &c., was not the result of a day. There was no sudden change wrought in them by which they were led into the bosom of the Roman Catholic church. For years before they made the transition, they held and preached substantially the same views they now hold as Romanists. The only difference is, they had not developed quite so far, and were not bold enough, or, as Mr. Wolff says, *they had not the gift of divine faith to give publicity to their real views.* Up to the very time at which Forney made the transition, he filled the pulpit of the Reformed church at Norristown. Wolff and Giesy were among the leaders in the Eastern Synod to the time they left, and were approved contributors to the *Reformed Church Messenger* and the *Mercersburg Review*. So high did Forney stand in the favor of his associates, that he was elected only a few weeks ago as the orator

of the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall College next year. A little over a year ago a sermon of his was published in the *Reformed Church Messenger*, in which his distrust of Protestantism appeared in more than one paragraph. If these men are asked to-day if they have lately changed their views in regard to the church, the ministry, apostolical succession, the sacraments, &c., they will unhesitatingly affirm that they have not, and that they now hold intellectually the same views which many of their friends in the Reformed church East do. There is no use in trying to evade it, humiliating as it is; there are those filling Reformed pulpits who hold and preach views not in harmony with the old faith of the church, whose doctrines they solemnly promised at their ordination to preach and defend. Many of the articles in the *Mercersburg Review* and *Reformed Church Messenger* would sound much better and be more in place in Episcopal and Romish periodicals. If the fathers of the Reformed church could come back and read articles like that of Rupp on Baptism, Kieffer on Educational Religion, and a hundred others of similar import, and then hear the venerable Dr. Fisher condemn all opposition to such views and try to quiet the fears of the church by saying these are the old doctrines—how would their indignation be aroused! One can almost imagine that they would be constrained to use authority, like Christ on a certain occasion did, and drive a score of such recreants out of the places they occupy to where they belong. Hear what Mr. Wolff, who knows full well what many of his friends in the Reformed church believe, says of their inconsistency in remaining where they are:

“How they can continue in this self-contradictory course; how they can introduce members by their counterfeit form of the Holy Sacrament of Confirmation into a religious system of whose truth they themselves have doubts, and which, with more or less clearness, some of them are convinced is false, schismatic and heretical; how they can professedly discharge the functions of a ministry which some of them are not satisfied is apostolical, and which others positively know to be *not* apostolical; how they can go through the ceremony of Protestant imitation and travesty of the Holy Communion, is more than we can understand.”

To speak against such a perversion of the old faith of the church as we and many others do, is not persecution, nor is it raising an unnecessary alarm. There is just cause for the opposition that has been shown to these new theories in the Reformed church. There is also a fearful responsibility resting upon those who introduced them and are using all the weight of their influence and positions to maintain and circulate them. It must certainly be a very sad reflection to Dr. Nevin and his associates, some of whom, like himself, are standing on the verge of the grave, to see the church distracted as it is, and every now and then one and another of their most promising pupils falling helplessly in the bosom of the Catholic church, thanking God for the instruction they received at their hands by which they were led where they are, and then calling upon their associates who have not yet taken the fatal leap to follow them, as the only manly and consistent course for them to take, holding the views they do. We confess, such things are mortifying to us, although our skirts are clean from all respon-

sibility in the case, having protested against these views and pointed out the impending danger.

We should beware lest the *frequency of these* transitions to the Episcopal and Romish churches should allay our fears and opposition. We are so constituted that we soon become accustomed to what often takes place. In years gone by it would have produced a profound sensation if only two ministers in the Reformed church had joined the Roman Catholics. Every one would have asked with deep solicitude, why is this? Should we be less, yea, ought we not to be more solicitous now, in view of the number that have taken this step? Dr. Fisher tells us he knows of no others who contemplate doing so. But he knew nothing of Mr. Forney, although only a few miles distant from him. He has often been deceived, and may be now. Those who have gone, say there are others of their friends who ought to follow them. They in all probability know a great deal more about this matter than Dr. Fisher does. One thing is very certain, there are very different views taught in many Reformed pulpits, and very much less regret felt on the part of not a few at persons joining the Romish church, than formerly. Why is this? Does it indicate a better or worse state of things? We leave the reader to answer.

What are the lessons we should learn from these sad things? We can only refer to a few.

1. We should seriously inquire into the cause of these defections. Every effect has its cause. Where did these perverts study, and who were their teachers?
2. Should those who have been warning the church of the danger that threatened her, be cried down as sensationalists? Have the fears they gave utterance to been groundless? What do the facts in the case say? Has Dr. Fisher or Dr. Bomberger been right?
3. We should inquire anew after the old landmarks which our fathers set us. These can be found in the Heidelberg Catechism, the Palatinate Liturgy, the Commentary of Ursinus, and works of a similar kind.
4. We should inquire with new interest if it is safe to allow a liturgy like that of the East, which contains doctrines and a scheme of worship different from what was ever known or approved of in the church until within twenty years past.
5. If these things continue, is it not likely that there will be more perverts go to the Episcopal and Romish churches; and what is perhaps worse, that the faith and simple worship of the Reformed church itself will in the course of time become perverted and our children trained in a new order of things.
6. We should hold fast with great firmness to the form of sound doctrine, and contend earnestly for the good old ways of the fathers of blessed memory.

G. W. W.



THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.—SEPTEMBER, 1873.—No. 9.

PAUL SMITTEN ON THE MOUTH.

WHEN and why, may be learned from Acts 23: 1, 2.

It was done by command of the high-priest Ananias. Paul had offended his dignity by rather boldly asserting the truth. Ananias did not wish to hear Paul tell the truth. What he wanted was, that the apostle should be condemned for certain things charged against him, but not proven. The accusations were utterly false and slanderous. Paul could prove them to be so. But the high-priest did not wish for such proof. He desired to hold Paul guilty, and was bent on punishing and silencing him.

Ananias had a number of reasons for hating Paul and wishing to put him down and destroy him. Some of these reasons were the following :

1. Paul preached the Gospel of Christ. But all the principles and doctrines of that Gospel are most decidedly contrary to sacerdotalism (Jewish, Romish, and every other form of it), high-churchism, ritualism, and everything of the sort. Where the Gospel of Jesus Christ prevails, such sacerdotalism, with all its false doctrines, vain ceremonies, and tyranny of priests, fails. The Gospel of His grace, and the gospel of the glorification of formal church rites, ceremonies, priestly authority, power to absolve from sin—that is, the Gospel of the glorification of men who fill high offices created in such a system for their own honor—these two Gospels are essentially antagonistic.

Ananias was shrewd enough to see this. He saw that his mitre and pontifical sceptre were in danger. Hence, so bold and zealous an apostle of this Gospel must be muzzled or slain.

2. Furthermore, Paul was proving himself a most efficient apostle of the Gospel; and by his zeal, his learning and courage, was leading many prominent Jews to renounce Judaism and embrace Christianity.

3. But what may most have nettled and provoked the high-priest, was the fact that Paul had once, in his blindness, been a zealous adherent of the high-priest and his party. As such he had rendered efficient service. This was well known to Ananias. And it made his hatred towards Paul all the more bitter, to think that such a disciple had turned against the cause he had once espoused. Ananias seemed to claim a sort of life-right in Saul of Tarsus, and was enraged that Saul should, through a discovery of the errors of Jewish sacerdotalism, have cast off his former allegiance.

When, therefore, Paul claimed the right of self-defence, and began in a way which at once showed Ananias that, if the apostle was allowed to proceed in that way, he would be likely to prove himself innocent of the vile accusations brought against him, Ananias flew into a rage.

He pretended to feel insulted at what Paul had said, viz.: "Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God and man until this day."

It is hard to see anything insulting in these words. But these human high-priests have often very tender sensibilities, when things are done or said against their notions, and contrary to their personal interests and ambitious schemes. Popes and high-priests cannot bear to be contradicted. They will not, mostly, tolerate any interference with their purposes and plots. When they set their minds upon destroying a man who is in their way, their wrath grows fierce as the wrath of a tiger or a hissing serpent. If they can bring it about, he must be scourged, or stoned, or crucified to death.

Often it puzzles them to make out a case against persons whom they hate, because they oppose them and expose their errors and their wrongs. Then they feign to have been insulted by what they may say, and to excite bitter feelings against them on this ground. *They* may insult and dishonor *God* as much as they please. But for any one to touch their honor, or question their authority, is a most heinous offence.

Ananias thought he had Paul in his power. The court before

which the apostle then stood, was composed of priests and others, associates of the high-priests, and, in a sense, under him. It was on his side. He felt that they would consent to anything he might do; that, as blind and passionate partisans, they would approve of his most arbitrary and tyrannical acts.

In those days the chief priests and members of the great council, had things pertaining to the Jewish church pretty much in their own hands. They could do, and did, whatever they pleased. If the plain and clear sense of the law did not suit them, they gave it a sense of their own which did suit them. And as the training schools of the church had been under their control for years, they had reared a generation upon whose support, or at least acquiescence, they could rather confidently rely.

In this way it was easy for the like of Ananias and his adjutants to secure a majority vote in favor of any measure they might propose, and to rally voices in praise or defence of any wrong they might perpetrate.

So far, therefore, he had Paul in his power. It was only necessary for him to say: Smite the fellow on the mouth, for daring to proclaim himself innocent, when I, the high-priest, and my Sanhedrim, hold him to be guilty; and forthwith hands were ready to smite the apostle. Not one hand only, we may safely infer, but several gladly obeyed the sacerdotal behest.

By the light of some incidents of later history, reported in detail, and possibly of familiar recent events known, one might almost picture the scene and draw portraits of those whose zeal for the high-priest and his cause may have prompted them to be most forward in the smiting, and strike the sharpest blows. But such portraits might suggest living likenesses, and be thought personal. It is better, therefore, to forbear.

Such sacerdotalism, or ultra-churchism, as Ananias and his abettors represent, is fond of smiting men who fear God more than his self-styled vicegerent, and who love God's truth above the errors of a false sacerdotal theology. Such men won't bear contradiction. To prove them wrong, is only to arouse their wrath. The more clearly it is proven, the fiercer their anger. Unable to answer some earnest witness for the truth against their falsehood, they resort to smiting. It is so much easier for them to kill a man than refute his arguments.

This has always been the spirit and manner of such sacerdotal-



ism. Illustrations of the fact are furnished by tens of thousands in the annals of Popery. They are not wanting even in our day.

By commanding Paul to be smitten on the mouth, Ananias expected to accomplish several things at once.

It was, of course, a gratification of his passion and malice.

Then it inflicted bodily pain on Paul. His main purpose, however, seems to have been to humiliate the apostle by this indignity done him. It would, he hoped, debase him in the sight of those around. They could taunt him as the man whom the high-priest would not deign to touch with his own hands, but whom he ordered to be smitten as a felon, by hireling hands—those of some clerk or scribe, or other menial.

Thus Paul would, he reckoned, be made contemptible in the eyes of the church, and the gospel which Paul preached be exposed to similar contempt.

O, to what meanness of iniquity the perverted and perverting Jewish and Popish scheme of sacerdotal churchism has always led those who have adopted and advocated it! What cruel wrongs, what malignant injustice it can perpetrate in the name of God; and even of Him who was so meek and lowly in heart, whose blessed mission, as the true and only high-priest in heaven or on earth, was not to smite men, but to save them!

O, with what shameful perverseness of hypocrisy has this same system, from the days of Caiaphas till now, striven to cloak and excuse its most arbitrary arrogance and assumptions of power, under the cover of some formal official act which it suggested and managed to get passed, calling such enactment the voice of God!

And so long as it has been able to carry the court with it, how eloquently it could plead for the sacredness of such "divinely authoritative acts."

That this has commonly been mere hypocritical pretense, has more than once been shown by the fact, that when such hierarchists fail in carrying their schemes, councils and synods are no longer held by them in such reverential regard.

#### *How Paul took the Smiting.*

*First*, as a *man*—a brave, natural man. Instead of being intimidated by what was done, he indignantly resented the insult and wrong. His words must have made the ears of Ananias tingle, and have almost drawn blood from his flushed cheek.

"Thou whited wall!" Rather severe words, but how true! And they must have smitten the high-priest's heart harder than his menials had struck Paul's mouth.

"God will smite thee!" A dreadful prediction. And it was literally fulfilled.

Proud, smiting sacerdotalism, is doomed of God. In due time He will bring down its ambitious head to the dust of the lowest degradation, and to the deepest hell. In proportion to its arrogant pretensions will be its fall.

Only let His people, who may now suffer from its tyranny, possess their souls in patience. The day of fearful vengeance for such sacerdotal foes of God and His true church will surely come. Vengeance is His. Leave its execution to Him.

But, secondly, Paul took the wrong done him, as a *Christian*. Recovering himself from the first effects of the cruelty and injustice, he made due amends.

Let the lesson not be lost upon us. Proper authority, even though in its human agents it may err and be abused, is to be duly respected. It is better to suffer wrong by a bad administration of law, than violently break down all law and order.

The wrong may be exposed and withstood; and it should be. But ever by lawful means.

---

#### GUIDE-POSTS.

THIS is the chosen, if not elegant phrase, of G. D. Wolff, by which to designate a certain school of ministers in the Reformed church who have loudly boasted of their advanced philosophy and theology. It appears now that the advance is backward. Of these he names, by way of eminence, Dr. J. W. Nevin, Dr. Thomas G. Apple, Dr. Gerhart, and Dr. Higbee, only one of whom is native to the Reformed church. "Protestant, theological doctors," he calls them with ill-concealed sarcasm, and scarcely mindful that he claims them as friends. These, however, he asserts, are "ever pointing out the road to Rome." For him this is unsatisfactory. He complains that they do not move themselves, but remain *only* guide-posts. He, as one of the advance guard

on the voyage to the Tiber, is weary of looking for the coming of those whom he left just ready to start when he launched his yacht on the dark stream that enters the sluggish Dead Sea. Really, after we read the homily pronounced to these and others in the Reformed church, "that see the rottenness of the Protestant platform," we are sure there is a vein of irritation in it—that the delay to *follow after* is becoming tedious, and that well-grounded expectations have been disappointed. Can they resist the appeal of their late associate? G. D. Wolff having traveled all the road from Mercersburg to Rome, and knowing what aids that vaunted philosophy and theology were to him, is competent to witness to the fact, and can testify to the value of these guide-posts as they bestowed on him their friendly offices in the days of darkness. He is free to say that they pointed steadily Romewards, while E. O. Forney was in the wilderness. Is not this a new and ignoble office for Protestant theological doctors? "By what casuistry do doctors acting in such office for Rome retain their positions in the colleges and seminaries of Protestant 'sects?'" Does the unpublished system of morals taught at Mercersburg and Lancaster so instruct the youth? or is a page borrowed from Escobar or some other Jesuit casuist? As the testimony to the office of the guide-posts is conclusive, and has thus far well served the Pope, it comes to us to ask, Why do these guide-posts direct travelers on the way to Rome through the ministry and pulpits of the Reformed church? Why not send direct, and not cumber with this "*sham*" ordination? Does this serve to degrade and make docile those who submit to the authority of Rome? What roots these Protestant theological doctors themselves so tenaciously in the soil of the Reformed church? Why do not all their students whom they point as persistently to Rome as the needle to the pole, and whom they goad with sneers at Protestantism—bald Puritans and the miserable sects—follow in haste Wagner, Wolff, Ermentrout and Forney? Does the charitable reason—a want of dim faith—account for this lingering? Or may it be prudential and economical? Do endowments—the loaves and fishes of salary—still beset their doubtful feet; or has no promise of love been made for the prodigals in Rome in the shape of professorships, editorial positions, etc.; or does a wife still look back and refuse to be divorced, or to deny her ancestral faith, as the guide-posts direct? Have not all the Romish books been studied that were so confidently recom-



mended by the doctors? Cannot Romish authority move their posts in the direction they point? Is it possible they must ever point and guide others, and never reach the bosom of the Holy Mother? They serve Rome best where they are, and injure Protestantism most. Sad is the work they have done for the Reformed church that has trusted and honored them. Sad is the ruin of hopes and souls they have wrought. Many are the souls that their guide-posts have led into the morasses and wild wastes of doubt and error—deluded by false hopes and dreams of peace and light that are not found but in heaven. Let solemn prayer be made in every Reformed church, that all these guide-posts to Rome accept the invitation of G. D. Wolff, and hasten to follow the demands of their intellects, and restore peace and unity to a communion that they have wickedly and wantonly torn and wounded. It is time that the Reformed Protestant church renounce such false and deceitful guide-posts—they mislead her sons, violate the confidence of the church, and are the most successful ministers of error and spiritual death. ZWINGLI.

---

REV. EDWARD O. FORNEY.

ANOTHER one of the Mercersburg ministers has passed over to Rome. This announcement will form a subject for discussion and comment in a great many circles. Many will feel it to be a deep disgrace to the Reformed church, that young men educated in her own institutions, and entering upon their work under the fairest of auspices, should thus throw contempt upon *Reformed doctrines*, ignore *Reformed history*, and prove recreant to the cause to which they had been solemnly set apart.

Of course, attempts will be made to explain away *the cause* of this defection, as was done in the previous cases of Wagner, Ermentrout, Stewart, Wolff, etc. Dr. Fisher has already given his explanation. It was because he surrounded himself "with fascinating Roman Catholic literature."

In the long history of the German Reformed church in this country, embracing over one hundred years, we do not remember that there was ever a case of a Reformed minister passing over to

the Romish church before the introduction of the so-called Mercersburg theology into our communion. But under the influence of this theology, the transitions have now become frequent, and it is to be noted that these transitions take place among the best and most thoroughly educated of the Mercersburg men; men who profess to be only following to their logical results, the teachings which their professors have given them, and the principles that have been sedulously implanted into them. For what was it that induced Forney to surround himself with such Roman Catholic literature? In the days when Dr. Fisher attended the theological seminary, before the profound (!) theology and philosophy of Mercersburg had cast their shadows over it, no such thing was ever heard of as a student or pastor surrounding himself with Romish literature. No such works were recommended to them, no special beauty was seen in them; no longing for the flesh-pots of Egypt that had been left far behind by our ancestors was indulged in, defended and excused. No, back of the Romish literature with which Forney had surrounded himself, there must have been some cause, some reason, some inducement in consequence of which this literature was sought and read. The purchase of that Romish literature was itself an effect of a previous cause. Our duty is to unearth that cause, and to drag it to the light of day. It is a small matter to quibble about the mode and manner of the transition; what the church is mainly concerned to know, is *the moving cause of this defection.*

Our explanation of this defection, as of the previous ones, is a very simple one. It came directly from the Mercersburg theology instilled into him from the principles advocated, extolled and defended by acknowledged leaders of that school. This was the motive power that induced him to surround himself with Romish literature; the principles and tendencies of the new movement, in his judgment, led logically to Rome; and he had sufficient consistency and nerve to follow his principles notwithstanding the obstacles that may have stood in his way. *All must feel*, even though many may be unwilling to admit, that it was the new priestly system that led these men to Rome. We think that fifty years hence no one will call in question so evident a fact. In the ecclesiastical history of the future, these defections will be credited to their true origin.

This is openly and positively asserted by G. D. Wolff, esq.,

editor of the "*Catholic Standard*," in the article copied from that paper into the August "*Monthly*." No doubt that article was read with painful interest by all our friends.

For the purpose of directing attention to some special points in said article, we will offer the following notes and comments. Our readers will please have the August "*Monthly*" before them for reference, and so save the time and space which would be required to publish it again:

1. "By these Protestant and theological doctors (*i. e.* Nevin, Harbaugh, Gerhart, Higbee and Apple) the first seeds of Catholic truth—so far as our knowledge extends—were implanted in his mind." This is the clear and decided testimony of George Dering Wolff, the sponsor of Forney at his re-baptism, once a favorite contributor to the *Messenger*, a prominent member of the Mercersburg school, and the very special friend of the one who has now gone to Rome. Can Mr. Wolff be possibly mistaken? Does he testify to that which he does not fully believe? We think not. We are convinced that he here tells the truth, and *the whole truth*.

In respect to the cause of these defections there are two main views. On the one hand we, from a study of the Mercersburg system as it is in itself, became convinced years ago, that it does, and logically must lead to Romanism. We have endeavored to point out from time to time its un-Protestant and non-Reform character. But to this it has been replied, that we are entirely mistaken; that the system (if such it can be called), properly understood, so far from leading to Rome, is the very strongest bulwark that has ever been erected against Rome. But why, then, do so many of the ablest of the Nevinites pass over to Rome? Oh, it is because of some peculiar idiosyncrasy of the mind; or a too exclusive dwelling upon one doctrine; or the influence of relatives and Catholic books; or disappointed ambition, &c. Let him who chooses believe all this trash. We have now the testimony of these converts themselves. Speaking from their own experience and consciousness, they now unhesitatingly affirm (a testimony which they have withheld heretofore, from a tender feeling towards their former friends), *that the seeds of that which has borne such bitter fruits for the Reformed church, were planted by the teachers above named*, and, we might add, were nourished by those who actively and passively upheld the system. In vain, after this,



will the *Messenger* protest that these men are mistaken ; that they did not understand the system. The time has arrived when this pretense will no longer avail.

2. What is said here of the talents of Mr. Forney is all correct, so far as our knowledge goes. We know that he was always extolled as a young man of most brilliant talents, just as his Norristown predecessors to Rome (Wolff and Ermentrout) were also held up as men of unusual ability. But if such men cannot understand the beauties of the Mercersburg movement, and rest in it with confidence, what claims can it have to the confidence of the masses ?

3. The history of the Norristown church and its pastors is deserving of attention in this connection. At the opening of the Mercersburg movement, we find here *G. D. Wolff*, full of zeal for the new ideas (as they were supposed to be), ready with pen and voice to defend the same. Norristown was one of the two leading Ritualistic churches in the Eastern Synod. In due time Mr. Wolff, without forsaking his Mercersburg principles, went over to Rome, and is now editor of the *Catholic Standard* of Philadelphia. Next came Mr. Ermentrout as pastor, laboring in the same spirit, and in due time landing in the same port, and occupying now an important educational position in the Roman church. Next came Rev. P. S. Davis, now of Chambersburg, an equally ultra-Nevinite, but as yet lingering in the outskirts of the Protestant camp. Then came Dr. Gans, under whom the new-order of worship was introduced in full, and in whose time the congregation and its services were held up in the *Messenger* as models for the administration of the Reformed church. Dr. Gans yet lingers within the pale of the Reformed church as pastor of a Baltimore church. It seems probable that these two men are included in the exhortation of Mr. Wolff, to press forward to consistency and peace within the Roman church. And, finally, we find Mr. Forney at Norristown, making the third of the Norristown pastors who have gone over to Rome. Out of five pastors, three have become Romanists. Is there something in the air of Norristown, or of the Norristown congregation, or of its services, genius and spirit, that bears its pastors Romewards ? If the congregation itself has had nothing to do in the way of preparing and assisting them in their defection, it has, to say the least, been remarkably unfortunate in its selection of pastors.

4. It is interesting to note the persons that were present at the baptism of Forney. We have here not only Mr. Wolff, but Mr. Budd, formerly a regular professor in Franklin and Marshall College. It will be recollected how vehemently it was denied, a few years ago, that the perversion of Mr. Budd to Rome, was caused by Mercersburg influences. We find him here very lovingly present at a remarkable gathering of old Mercersburg men.

It will be noticed, also, that Mr. Forney, when he became a Romanist, felt it to be his duty to be baptized a second time. This was as much as confessing, on Mercersburg principles, that he had never been a *regenerate man*: that although pretending to be an ordained minister and servant of God for years, yet all that time he had not been a renewed man, because the grace of baptism is the *only way* by which a man can be regenerated, and this baptism he now received for the first time. Every one can see here to what a depth of despair the Mercersburg doctrine of baptism must inevitably lead. The inner state of the soul and its relation to God is made to be absolutely dependent upon an outward rite, and yet no certainty is at hand that this outward rite is legitimately administered and effective. If Mr. Forney had never before been legitimately baptized, then, according to his own principles, his ordination was invalid, his priestly character a sham: his baptisms and confirmations in Norristown were invalid and non-effective, and the members have no certitude of being in a state of grace, because the channel through which they thought to receive the same was a sham, a "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." Where now is the *comfort* of the doctrine of the *Special Priesthood* to the unfortunate members of this church? According to their late and beloved pastor, a man "of the highest order of intellectual ability," his special priesthood was all a mistake, their reception of grace through him was a delusion and a snare. How much better the genuine Protestant and *Scriptural* doctrine of the general priesthood of believers, according to which the believer has direct access to God, direct forgiveness of sin, direct reception of grace, without being absolutely dependent upon an intermediary priest, who has no confidence in his own priestly character, in its functions, nor in the doctrines that he pretends to preach.

5. Mr. Wolff's congratulations to Forney, that after doubts and struggles he has found certainty and peace, are, we doubt not, gen-

uine, and from the heart, and based upon experience. For many years he was himself tossed to and fro upon the sea of doubt and difficulty, and it was by no means a pleasant state to be in. On the one side were the Mercersburg teachings concerning the church, the special priesthood, the efficacy of the sacraments, &c., all of them most clearly not congruent with the principles of the Protestant Reformation. And these teachings come from high and respected sources, from men learned and able beyond all others (as it was affirmed); from men of deep earnestness, and appointed by the church to direct them in their studies and views. They felt that, holding such views, they were logically in a false position while continuing to stand in the Reformed church; they were teaching doctrines that was clearly not the historical doctrine of the Reformed church; they were pretending to an efficacy of the sacraments, and of a priestly character not consistent with the standards of the church; in doubt all the while whether they had ever been legitimately baptized and ordained, and thus authorized to exercise priestly functions. To all this were added the difficulties arising from old associations, old traditions, a pious and protestant ancestry, dependent families, &c. It was many years before Mr. Wolff himself emerged from out of this state of doubt. We feel infinitely more at peace now, so he assures us, and he has a right to congratulate Mr. Forney on his emergence from the same state of doubt and darkness. *Now* he is no longer in a *false position*; preaches no longer to a protestant congregation, whilst he has no faith in protestant doctrine: dispenses no sacraments according to the protestant order, whilst he has no confidence in the validity of such sacraments; exercises no priestly functions while in doubt whether he has authority to do so; does not stand-forth outwardly as a Reformed minister, whilst he is inwardly an adherent of the Pope. Who can doubt the genuineness of the congratulation that he has been rescued thus from living for months and years a *living lie*?

6. His appeal to the Norristown congregation has probably a deep meaning. Mr. Wolff was formerly their pastor, and has lived in their midst for a quarter of a century, and no doubt is intimately acquainted with their views and tendencies. He affirms plainly enough, that the congregation "accepted as true, his forcible exposition of principles, which find their legitimate practical conclusion only in the bosom of Catholicity." He intimates that he



expects them to follow Forney into the Roman church. For they accepted his principles on the subject of the church, its "divine institution, unity, perpetuity and authority;" why not then follow him whither these principles lead? We know nothing of the disposition and feelings of the people of his late charge; but no one need be surprised if some walk in the way pointed out. *We have long been convinced that the chief effect of the new-order and the Mercersburg theology, is to educate ministers and people for a gradual transition to the Roman Catholic and Episcopal churches;* and the experience of each successive year only confirms this.

Behold here the practical result of the adoption of the much-vaunted system by a congregation. The Norristown church was one of the first to adopt it. It has made full trial of it, and of some of the very best and most talented of the Nevinistic ministers. And what is the result, after an experience of a quarter of a century? Three of its ministers in the bosom of Popery; two others in a wavering position; and a strong hope held out that some of the congregation will follow in the same way.

7. Mr. Wolff's appeal to ministers of the Mercersburg school is also of very deep significance. He evidently knows what he is writing about. He knows that there are others who, *in principle*, stand where Forney stood a few months ago, and who *logically and consistently* should go where he is now. "Many of them preach truths that can only find their practical fulfillment in the Catholic church." "They have no faith in Protestantism." By their preaching as Reformed ministers, they proclaim "their confidence in a system which, in their hearts, *many of them doubt and others entirely disbelieve.*"

Is this true? Have we still such men amongst us? Who can doubt it?

8. His appeal to the Professors and their disciples, we confess, comes with powerful force. To preach that which one does not believe, to administer sacraments that we think are no sacraments, to pretend to a priesthood that we believe we do not possess, to labor in a ministry that we positively hold not to be apostolical—all this is certainly terrible. To deceive a confiding church, to undermine her faith while pretending to defend the same, to pervert her doctrines while pretending to preach the truth, this certainly manifests a sad state of mind and heart. And yet Mr. Wolff plainly intimates that there are not a few ministers in the

Reformed church who are precisely in this position. Living a living lie where they are, and afraid to encounter the obstacles in the way of consistency and truth.

9. The reason why the remainder of the Mercersburg men do not go over to Romanism, according to the best judgment of Mr. Wolff, is not because they are not intellectually convinced that Protestantism is wrong and Romanism is right; nor because they sincerely hold to the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism, in their true historical sense; nor because they have confidence in their present position—but because they have not "*faith*," that faith which is the gift of God. It may be instructive here to examine what Mr. Wolff's conception of faith is. Evidently he does not mean that they are lacking in—

(a) an intellectual conviction of the falsity of the principles of Protestantism;

(b) or a personal assurance that they are in a false position and in false relations.

(c) Nor does he refer to a lack of the faculty of faith (according to Dr. Nevin's favorite idea,) whereby the person lays hold of the truth.

This idea of faith seems to include:

(a) *Courage* to follow principles to a legitimate and logical conclusion.

(b) An act of *obedience* to claims that are in the heart allowed to be right.

This same idea of faith we have frequently met with in the speeches and writings of Dr. Nevin, according to which it means simply the "courage of obedience." Whoever has the courage and obedience to receive baptism, confirmation, ordination, submission to the church or the creed, he has *faith*. We understand Mr. Wolff to mean that, in view of the claims of wives and children, of relatives and associations, of past professions and present advantages, these men have not yet received the "courage of obedience." God must give it to them as He gave it to Ermentrout, Wolff and Forney. Is there not a certain amount of truth in this? Does not this statement cut far and deep into the innermost spiritual posture of many of his old compatriots in the new movement?

10. This sort of "faith" now, this courage to obey the Holy Church of Rome, has been withheld by God, for the present yet,

from the "Mercersburg teachers" mentioned by Wolff. They are as yet "guide-posts, ever pointing out the road to Rome, but never moving forward one step themselves;" "not *able* to move forward." Therefore Mr. Wolff takes refuge in prayer (as Roman Catholics have so often before done in behalf of the Mercersburg movement), that "God may give them grace and light and strength, thaty the *may follow those* whom \* \* it might have been supposed *they would precede* into the loving embrace of \* \* the church."

We know what replies will be ready to meet all this. It will be said that Mr. Wolff has not properly understood the Mercersburg system; that he and others had not the necessary intellectual ability or philosophical culture to grasp it properly. But, if so, how can it be supposed that the great mass of men will ever properly grasp the system. Must they receive it blindly, by an act of desperate obedience? History is forever repeating itself. *Pusey* started a movement in the Episcopal church which led more than one thousand of its clergymen into the church of Rome, though he himself remains behind even yet in the Anglican church. The Puseyite movement, so powerful in its start, has vanished as a dream of the past; and so the corresponding movement in the Reformed church is only repeating the same folly.

This article by Mr. Wolff we regard as very important, because it gives the first clear and decided public expression of the motives and influences that led him and Forney and Ermentrout into the church of Rome. Doubtless, too, it speaks for Wagner, (who, as we see from the *Catholic Standard*, has now a Catholic school under his care in Lancaster, Pa., right under the shadow of F. and M. College), and Stewart and Budd. The man must be blind indeed who cannot see that the Mercersburg theology leads to Rome.

J. H. G.

---

#### AFTER THE WOLVES!

"I wish to know by what casuistry English clergymen holding such doctrines retain their positions in the church?" This is the pertinent question in morals raised in the English House of Lords



by Lord Abercorn. What has aroused this peer of the realm and member of the English church? The thirty-nine articles of his church are Scriptural and thoroughly Protestant and anti-Romish. He seems to hold its doctrines and sterling Protestant record, *but 483 of its clergy have petitioned the authorities to establish the Confessional and restore other Romish practices abolished by the Reformation.* It is of these clergy and their conduct he asks this question. It is not this *noble* Lord only that is awaked, but 60,200 others, members of the English Established Church, have petitioned for redress against the practice of Romish and semi-Romish clergy in their parish churches. John Bull is slow in his intellectual motions, but now he is aroused, and no wonder. The *treachery* of these 483 clergy, and others who were solemnly pledged to teach the doctrines of the articles and the Ritual as established, and who, cunningly, have introduced Romish practices, taught Romish error and still retain their place and emoluments, amazes them. This want of honesty has raised the indignation of these honest men. And now they boldly ask that the English church come to them—sanction their deeds and Romanize their church. This is too much—this depraved effrontery of perjured ecclesiastics—it awakens inquiry. It is the *cowardly* and *mercenary* deeds of these recreant churchmen that provoke inquiry as to their moral code. Romanist at heart—practicing Romish mummary—they refuse to leave a Protestant church on whose titles and endowments they live. Such men have forfeited all respect; without courage and without integrity they would foist themselves on a people that hold another faith. All they care for is the benefices, and to these they cling and forego all the honor of prophets and martyrs. Perverts to Rome are not of such stern stuff, and scarcely even rise to respect. This English clergy have earned the unmitigated contempt of the English yeomen.

As clergy of the church of England, pledged to teach and maintain its Protestant doctrines, and teach the people so—in the guise of Protestant ministers they teach the people Romish error—lead the unsuspecting into mazes of doubt, engage them in Romish practices, while they, unsuspecting, do not know that they are mislead and drifting toward idolatrous Rome. This *perfidy* does not suit an Englishman, and his indignation burns against the men who can thus betray their trust.

The danger wrought by these men to their ancestral church,

loudly called for this movement. These men must be ousted or the church perish—God cannot bless a church that holds such base-minded men as its ministers. No longer can their church be the “bulwark of Christianity.” Lord Abercorn had only need to study Jesuitical casuistry to learn under what pretense these clergy retained their position. It is a morality that destroys all the bonds of society—that permits right, and is peculiar to Rome, and is especially practiced by its neophytes. All these base deeds can minds, morally debased, do in the name of the Romish religion? These Englishmen—Lords and people—have taken hold of the matter and seem determined that their doctrine—their church—their worship, shall not be Romanized. On the authority of G. D. Wolff, there are “*many*” such clergy in the Reformed church—“ministers”—who by the same casuistry retain their positions and use the endowments of a Protestant church, while they are guide-posts to Rome—“even pointing out the way.” It may be asked with equal pertinency, by what code of morals—by what principles of honesty do these guide-posts retain their position in the Reformed church? “They preach truths that only find their practical fulfillment in the Catholic church,” while sworn to preach the ultra-Protestant doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism. Is it not time for our Reformed people to determine that our Protestant heritage shall be saved. It is no loss to the Reformed church that ten or twelve restless spirits have followed the pointings of the guide-posts and gone to Rome, but the loss and danger is in those that remain. The burden shown is not that some Romishly misled are gone, but that others still remain to entice and mislead, to corrupt and annoy the public minds, whose solemn, motionless finger still points the weak, restless, and disappointed to Rome, and calls the gaze of the world to the Reformed church. Down with the false, deceiving guide-posts. Let the example of the sturdy English churchmen move the Germans for the safety of their church and its purgation from Romanism. KNOX.

---

THE *Jewish Messenger* says: “It is intimated that the sessions of Maimonides College, Philadelphia, will soon be suspended, as the number of students does not increase, and the public do not appear to manifest any interest in the welfare of the institution.”

## WHO ARE REFORMED AND PROTESTANT YET?

THE announcement in the public papers that *Rev. E. O. Forney*, of the Reformed church at Norristown, Pa., had made a retreat in the Romish Catholic church, was no surprise, and did not startle any one who is conversant with the views and practices of that school in theology to which he held, viz.: the so-called Mercersburg school, under the leadership of Dr. J. W. Nevin, of Lancaster. We have before us the editorial of G. D. Wolff—last a minister in the same church, and who preceded his friend Forney to Rome—in the *Catholic Standard* of July 12th. As this is a very frank and candid utterance from one who knows, it is our purpose to invite attention to some points in it that may be of interest to the Reformed church. We need not say that Mr. Wolff is worthy of confidence as to the correctness of his statements; also, that his relations with the prominent members of this Mercersburg school well qualifies him to speak of their peculiar doctrines and of their position towards the church of Rome; and, still further, his own progress under their guidance; though this school to the church of Rome enables him to speak most confidently of the *tendency* of its leading teachings. In accounting for Mr. Forney's throwing himself "into the loving arms of our Holy Mother the (Romish) church," he says: "*The first seeds of Catholic truth—so far as our knowledge extends—were implanted in his mind by those Protestant theological doctors, J. W. Nevin, Harbaugh, Gerhart, Higbee and T. G. Apple.*" This could not well be more direct and explicit; and we hope that the mind of our good and easy friend, Dr. Fisher, is now set at rest, and that he has reliable testimony as to *where* the seed came from, and by whom it was sown, that produces the harvest of fruit in the Reformed church, but reaped by the church of Rome. Can it be matter of doubt that the *sponsor* of Mr. Forney, and his friend, was mistaken as to the means by which he was perverted from his ancestral faith?

We extract further: "His (Forney's) friends, too, in the Protestant ministry of the same theological school with himself, who hold intellectually the same ideas, . . . MANY of them, we are sure, see the rottenness of the Protestant platform on which they stand. MANY of them preach truths that can only find their practical fulfillment in the Catholic church." We beg



our readers to notice that those who have gone to Rome, leave yet "MANY" in the Reformed church ministry; that their friend, confidant and whilom associate, is *sure* they see the *rottenness* of the Protestant platform. How many congregations in our communion are to-day served by these *many* ministers, and they have no thought of it, as in the case at Norristown. Our "Sleepy Hollow" friend, who oversees the *Messenger*, and has the *outlook* over the church, will also get light here; and we hope he will reprint the whole article from the *Standard*.

Really, the editor does not seem to understand the secret workings of Mercersburg. Who is it that dares deny the broad assertion of G. D. Wolff, over his own name? Dr. Bomberger, the Classis of North Carolina, the Protestant press, have been charged with slanderous utterance in intimating less than is here boldly declared by one who has had, and *now* has, the means to know whereof he speaks. We repeat it: who in the columns of the *Messenger*, over his own name, will dare deny the correctness of the statements of G. D. Wolff, and bring out facts, names and men that will satisfy the church?

The writer does not in this article propose to argue the truth or untruth of the Mercersburg theology. G. D. Wolff declares that it sowed the seed in the mind of E. O. Forney that led him logically to the Romish church. Does any sane man believe, or say, that the teaching of the doctrines of the Heidelberg Catechism, honestly and fairly interpreted, *could* do this, or ever did do it? Who is prepared to assert that its authors or compilers and the staunchest Protestant churches for 300 years have held, taught and believed, doctrines that contained the seeds that, when matured, were unmixed Romanism? Drs. Nevin, Gerhart, and T. G. Apple, of Lancaster, and Higbee, of Mercersburg, are now, as honest men, put on the defensive. They are referred to by name; they are the Protestant doctors who sowed the Romish seed in the mind and heart of their pupil Forney. No longer can these Rabbis fall back upon their dignity. The charge involves their *moral* character. It is not made by a partisan. It is made by one who cherishes their teachings still—who avers, if we are not in error, that it was by them his confidence in the faith of his fathers was destroyed. Only two ways are *possibly* open to these doctors: Resign their places and follow Forney to Rome, or else disprove the allegations of Mr. Wolff; take issue with him on the

facts he asserts, and satisfy the church that he is in error, and has wronged them. Will they demand of their friend the proof? will they dare him to an array of facts, and of men, as he knows them? If they be honest and fearless men, they will not dare to be silent, nor content themselves with denials, or with the assertions of their friends for them.

The allegations of Mr. Wolff do not stop with the doctors of theology at Lancaster and Mercersburg, but "the Board of Visitors" are also involved in their official and personal character. Brethren, is it true that the church reposing confidence in you—you have suffered the teachers in theology under your charge to sow the seeds of Romanism in the minds and hearts of the students preparing for the ministry in the Reformed or Protestant church. The charge is wider than this. It is alleged that you annually have given certificates to the graduates of the seminary at Mercersburg and Lancaster, of qualification as ministers in a Reformed Protestant church, who saw the *rottenness of the Protestant platform* on which they stood.

Gentlemen, does G. D. Wolff bear false witness against you? or did you so perfunctorily discharge your duty to your church and your God that you never discovered these facts, and ignorantly did the cause of Christ this harm, or were you all this while in league with the Professors, against the Reformed church, quietly to Romanize its ministry and to subvert the church, whose doctrine you and they had sworn to teach? Silence will not do longer. Your fidelity is impeached—impeached by one who alleges that he knows whereof he asserts. Appearances, yea facts, are against you. Did you not affirm of Messrs. Wolff, Wagner, Ermentrout, Forney and others? Does not the allegation include that they received teaching in the seminary that was the seed of their retreat to Rome? Does it not involve the fact that they carried the seeds from the seminary, when you gave them your endorsement that legitimately prepared them for the arms of the Romish church? It is expected that as high-minded men, as faithful public servants of the church of Christ, that you will with open face meet the issue. Your fidelity is in question, not by your theological foes, but by those who carry your endorsement—by your associates and church friends. It has at last awakened the church, and it would know of you. Neither can the doctors who sowed this seed, or the Board of Visitors who

"watered" it, or at least "slept while the enemy sowed the tares," escape by demanding that charges be preferred against them, and that a trial be given them before a lawful and competent tribunal. That sham-work was carried through its humbug course in the early days of this sowing of Romish seeds. Why the court and accursed are all one. The charge now comes outside the Reformed church. They are made by reliable parties—bear the imprint of truth—are sustained by facts. They relate to moral and official conduct, and must arouse public feeling. As one of the Reformed church, we demand that the charges of G. D. Wolff, and so confirmed, shall be refuted, or, if held, then allowed to be true without further denial. We also demand, as a minister, and as the peer of any minister, whatever his official position, that Dr. Fisher, in the *Messenger*, disprove the allegations of G. D. Wolff as to the number of the intellectual Romanists in the Reformed ministry, or else cease to plead ignorance of their existence. He cannot ignore the allegation, that *many* Reformed ministers see the rottenness of the Protestant platform. It is matter of evidence. Let the church know it. Unless the truth is given your readers, they have a right to complain. They would know whether you or your friend Wolff are correct. It will not do to say that this demand is made in an unauthorized publication. You read it. The charge is made in a publication authorized by the Romish Bishop of Pennsylvania, and that will be authority that can justify your attention.

Ministers of the Reformed church, who sit in our Classis as members, who hold seats in our Synods, who claim to be Protestant teachers, who have sworn to preach Protestant doctrines, who fill Reformed pulpits, and are trusted by the members of our church—"many of you" are charged with "preaching truths that can only find their practical fulfillment in the church of Rome." These *cannot* be the truths taught in the Heidelberg Catechism. Is it possible that this can be true? Are *many* of our pulpits filled by such men? Is it perjured men and deceivers that our honest people listen to? What kind of morality did Lancaster and Mercersburg teach these men? That of Molinos and Escobar? of the Jesuits or Christ? How could they thus "give the lie direct to what they preach," if they had been taught Christ's morality? Come out; throw off the sheep's clothing; follow Forney; avow your Romish faith. G. D. Wolff holds you up as



hypocrites and perjured. The eye of the Reformed church is upon you; the world expects you to act honestly. Throw off disguise. You must act. Prove G. D. Wolff a slanderer, or admit that you are dishonoring yourselves.

Good people of the Reformed church, the son of the lately revered Dr. Wolff says the seeds of Romanism that lead so many of our ministers to Rome, are sown by our *own* Professors in our *own* schools at Mercersburg and Lancaster. He gives the names of the Professors and the places. He says that many of the ministers in *our* church are intellectually Romanists; that they see that the platform of *our* church is rotten, and *their* church, too. Is your minister one of them? Ask him honestly, and demand a direct answer. If he is, and you approve, then go with him to Rome. If he is, and you do not agree, then demand that he shall accept the invitation of G. D. Wolff, be an honest man, and go at once to his retreat. If G. D. Wolff well and truly represents the teaching of our seminary and college—if he speaks truth of our ministry, then we are no more a whole church. *Do we not need another Myerstown Convention?* Should not those of us who are Protestants act in concert, and free ourselves of this Romish tendency in some way?

What is now written or asserted, is alone on the evidence of the *Catholic Standard*, or its editor, G. D. Wolff. We care not to refer to private information, nor to draw on our own resources, or even to use the authority of a writer in the *Christian World*, of Cincinnati, O., of July 17. The demands we make are only such as are proper in the case. If they are refused, then let no parties feel themselves aggrieved at being accounted as giving countenance to, and teaching the errors of Rome—as being derelict in duty in giving credence to assertions of loyalty to the church. The teaching of our seminary makes Romanists; many of our ministers are intellectual Romanists. The teaching should be made Reformed and Protestant, and these Romish ministers be sent home.

ULRIC.

---

PANAPHORE, India, has been favored with a revival so great as to attract the heathen from the adjacent villages. They are crying out, as on the day of Pentecost, "What shall we do?"

REV. E. O. FORNEY'S DEFECTION.

ROCK DALE, PA., July 20th, 1873.

*Dear Editors of Monthly:* Give our few hastily written lines a place in your columns. We would offer some thoughts on the late defection of Rev. E. O. Forney, who is now in the Romish church, and which is just the place for him and all others of that ilk. To censure Forney is base and cowardly; any man that does so, in our eyes, is perfidious; nor should any one exult over the fact of his perversion. It is to be deplored.

That some parties in our Zion are mortified, is very natural. They have been supinely looking on, as the work has been accomplished through a series of years; aye, often defending those who were justly charged as Romanizing in their teaching. That strange doctrines are inculcated by some in our church cannot be denied. From a Reformed stand-point, error calculated to lead our young men out of the church.

Those who have defended the course should be mortified, but far better would it be for our Reformed branch of Evangelical Protestantism if they were truly penitent for the part they took in helping Forney on to Rome. It is sad enough to see them go over into the Episcopal church and enter the ministry there, while our parishes remain unsupplied. Dr. Nevin had two sons enter that communion. Dr. Kieffer had a son to enter the same. Dr. Zahner's son left our church in his senior year, for the episcopate. Elder Swartz's son, the first term at the Seminary. Others might be mentioned. This is sad enough, that even such work is tolerated by us, but to have them prepared by the score, in a score of years for Rome, is very sad. One thing struck us in reading the leaders of the *Messenger*, that there is no disposition manifested by its pliable editor to assist in putting an end to the bad work of Romanizing amongst us. He puts the blame, to shield the guilty, where it does not belong. He even undertakes to show (*no, he asserts it, as if it was an undeniable truth,*) that no blame rests on the present Faculty of the Seminary at Lancaster for the defections in our church to Rome. Does he think all his readers are blind devotees of Mercersburgism? that they believe what he writes in defence of the Lancaster theological savans? If so, he is mistaken. Some of his oldest, best-paying, and most intelligent readers, are fully persuaded of the bad tendency of

Mercersburg theology. They are disgusted with his lame attempt. Poor dupe.

No blame to attach to Mercersburg-Lancaster men! Absurd! How could he insult his truly Reformed readers again? Does he forget *Tract No. 3*, by Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D.D., President of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster? The whole "Tract" is a clear and unmistakable statement of the fundamental error of Romanism. Does he not know that another professor, not many years ago, declared that he did not hold to the distinction made by *our* teacher, Dr. Schaff, of visible and invisible church?

Not to hold it, is papistic. Does the Dr. deny this? Does he not know that leading ministers of the Mercersburg-Lancaster school declare from the pulpit, that the Christian life cannot commence in the soul of man, or of woman, or of a child but by baptism? Does he forget that the rudiment of that which Forney has now in development, is *the basis* of the new-order of worship? Does he forget that as long as our clergy use the form of baptism of said "Order of Worship," they teach the most absurd view of baptismal regeneration, only taught by Mercersburg divines and Romanists? In 1862 he was alive to it. Alas, how has the man fallen!

Let the blame for the perversions to Rome be laid where it belongs. To men in high places of the Mercersburg type.

It must be gratifying to the Romish church, that the rudiment of their whole exploded theology is tenaciously held and taught by the doctors of divinity at Lancaster. And to tell us that George D. Wolff has made a malicious statement, as "Esq." does in the daily *Express* of Lancaster, is to tell us we have no eyes and no ears. We have seen with our eyes, and we have heard with our ears, and our *Reformed feelings have been outraged*.

If they do not teach the doctrines now, let them come out in the *Messenger*, in a card. If the *Messenger* will not give them room, our church paper, we think, will, and discard publicly the heretical "*Tract No. 3*;" let them say that they have discarded the theory of baptismal regeneration of the "Order of Worship," a book most odious, because *different* from *anything*, as Dr. Nevin tells us honestly, of the kind, ever used in our church, either *in this or any other country*.

Let the young men from their school give no uncertain sound on any of the doctrines of our venerable evangelical Christian Reformed Heidelberg Catechism.



If Forney did not teach that which he was taught at Lancaster, why did he obtain license? Mr. Forney never deceived them. The tenets we held, they endorsed. If they did not, and dismissed him honorably from the Seminary, they deserve to be held in detestation. George Wolff never taught him theology. He was taught at Lancaster. And we respect him (Forney) for going to Rome as soon as he did. It is honorable—there is something Christian in it—but for men to disseminate the seeds of Romanism for years in a church [“acting as guide-posts”] like our Reformed, is dishonorable, unchristian. It deserves to be denounced in the strongest language the editor of the *Messenger* can command. Please, Dr. F., strike at the root? We not believe you will. Dr. R., strike at the root, you did nobly in your leader. An honest confession is a good beginning. You can do the church good. It is in your power. It may demand some sacrifice, but the reward will be three-fold greater. You stood on the precipice and “looked down.” Now, please Dr. R., strike at the root. Strike at the offspring of Romanism in the Order of Worship. Strike at the errors taught in a semi-way; you very well know where. Strike at everything that has a tendency to Romanism. Strike at every one who will not be truly *Evangelical Protestant Reformed*.  
S. W.

---

NEVIN'S DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION AND BAPTISM  
TESTED BY REFORMED STANDARDS.

FOLLOWING up Mr. Rupp's defence of the Mercersburg or Nevinite theory of regeneration and baptism, we are glad to find him make some effort at least to support the new doctrine (new, that is, for Evangelical Christianity, and for the Reformed church) by *an appeal to Reformed standards of belief*.

For many years the chief teachers and advocates of Nevinism have not shown much concern to harmonize their theological speculation with the faith of their church. They were too busy beating new theories out of their own brains, and too intent upon burnishing them and commending them as the brightest things which had ever illumined American theology and the American

Protestant church, to think or care about the agreement or disagreement of those theories with the Heidelberg Catechism, or any other Reformed Confessions. They seemed more anxious to prove that they were in accord with the theology of the third and fourth centuries, the theology of Cyprian, Cyril, of Alexandria, and later teachers of views which led directly to some of the worst errors of Popery.

It is true Dr. Nevin wrote the "Mystical Presence," in the historical part of which he tried adroitly to lay a foundation for his Romish view of the Sacraments and the Lord's Supper, by quotations from Calvin and others. But he failed to prove his point. And in the second part of his book he advocated a theory which scarcely anybody pretends to have understood.

It is also true that the same writer wrote a small book on the "History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism," and a Preface to Dr. Williard's edition of Ursinus' Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism. In both he commends the noble, old confession, and its author.

But it is no less true, he afterwards spoke and wrote in disparagement and even ridicule of Reformed principles, and of a preference of them to those of the third and fourth century fathers. This we have several times shown by quotations from his writings.

Evidently, the Mercersburg doctors expected and hoped to carry the Reformed church with them in their theological novelities, by the force of their assumed profound philosophy and learning, and by having the College and Seminary of the Synod in their hands. Hence, for a long time they gave themselves little trouble with efforts to show that their theology was in harmony with that of our church.

Indeed, they rather boasted of it as something wonderfully original and new.

They have found, however, that as such, it will not take, either as a theology, in principle, or as a cultus (mode of worship) in practice. With all their learning, influence, and skill in scheming and tactics, they can't succeed in persuading the Reformed church to accept their new gospel with its ritualism.

Consequently, the mode of procedure must be changed. They must quit praising Popery, as they have so long been doing, and begin to oppose it, or at least to seem to do so, by joining the old

Catholics (Doellinger and his friends) in denouncing Papal infallibility. This they can do, and yet hold on to most other Popish errors in doctrine, and abominations in practice. Did not Dr. J. W. Nevin publish a terrible article against Popery; *that is, Papal Infallibility*, in the April number of the *Mercersburg Review*? And has he not said some very hard things against Popery, lately, in the *Messenger*? Surely, he is no Romanist! Can't the people see it?

In about the same way the leading advocates of the new theology feel driven to try and show *that their views are Reformed!* The attempt comes in rather awkwardly and late. They have, indeed, been very cautious not to publish their theology in anything like a systematic way, so that one might see the whole of it. Even Dr. Harbaugh's lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism, so highly commended, and so warmly promised, have not yet been published. Still, so many articles have been written by Drs. Nevin, Apple, Gans, Gerhart, Higbee and others, setting forth some very peculiar views, that *a great deal will have to be forgotten or wiped out* before a harmony between Reformed and Nevinite theology can be demonstrated.

Nevertheless, we hail the attempt. There may be a ray of promise in it. The attempt must prove a failure, of course. But even the failure may lead to good results, as, in part, it has done already.

*The propriety of such a test*

must be obvious. In a very important sense, the very first point to be determined in regard to the doctrines maintained by Nevinism is, are they *Reformed*; or can they be at all reconciled with the faith of our church?

By this we do not mean at all to set up Reformed theology as infallible, as an ultimate standard of appeal, or as incapable of any improvement. Our church declares the *Word of God written* to be the ultimate rule of faith. This is our conviction on the point.

But the Reformed church *has proclaimed* in its Confessions what it believes to be the doctrines of God's Word, "the faith once delivered to the saints," in all essential matters. And all the ministers and members of the church are bound by the faith thus laid down.



More than this, the Reformed church has for three hundred years distinctly avowed and maintained that faith. It regards it as an important part of its mission and work to uphold, preach, and extend that faith. For this it has toiled, and prayed, and suffered.

For this faith it has founded schools, and colleges, and theological seminaries, at which its sons might be trained for special service in the church.

For this its Synods have elected teachers and professors, and provided for their support. Those thus chosen and supported by the income on hundreds of thousands of dollars given for the purpose, have been required to bind themselves by a solemn oath to teach, maintain, and defend the well-known principles and established faith of the church.

The institutions of the church were not established as schools of theological exploration for the possible discovery of truths unknown, or doctrines lost. They were not let out as ships in which bold adventurers might sail in search of some new passage to the port of Rome.

It never sought or wanted professors who, not satisfied with its theology or faith, might indulge their scientific tastes and find some resting-place for the soles of their feet by virtually abandoning its creed, and either inventing one of their own or adopting that of another church. It has told them what it *requires* them to teach, maintain and defend, so long as they hold office under its appointment.

The Reformed church is satisfied with the faith of the Apostles, as handed down by the Reformed fathers, in Reformed Confessions. If any ministers or professors can no longer conscientiously hold or teach that faith, the church gives them their liberty. But that liberty is not to teach another doctrine in its schools. Especially does the church not ask or wish them to teach doctrines which our fathers rejected as false, and which is contrary to the faith of the church and subversive of that faith.

All this needs no proof. The Constitution declares it as plainly and as emphatically as plain and simple language can make it.

Old truths may be inculcated by new and fresh illustrations; old doctrines may be vindicated by more potent arguments than any ever before used. But the church does not desire new truths

or doctrines, or rather speculations claiming to be such, to be substituted for the old, sacred, established faith.

Galileos and Newtons do good service in astronomy and physics. All the facts and principles of physics and astronomy may not yet be discovered.

But the church does not call or employ men to play a theological Newton or Galileo in its service. It holds that all essential truth and doctrine were clearly revealed, and freely known, long before any philosophers of this generation were born.

Of this the more discerning disciples of Nevinism are becoming aware. Hence, the change in their way of dealing with matters involved in the controversy they have excited.

Now, they are trying to soften down or round the sharp corners of their doctrines, so as to make it possible to tie them up with Reformed theology. They do not confess that they have taught error in a single point. No concessions worth naming, no changes are made. But things are put less boldly, more plausibly, and, where it is thought needful, are puttied over, so as to make the angles fit.

Very well. Let the effort be made. It may do some good; even though it should serve only to expose more clearly the utter impossibility of reconciling Romish or semi-Romish errors with evangelical Reformed truth.

We are glad, however, that Mr. Rupp, by making the attempt in this instance, as much as admits that Nevinism *ought to be* able to show *some* agreement with our standards of faith.

But, here again he is chargeable with

*Evading the real point*

at issue. He must, therefore, be once more brought back to that point. We cannot permit him to assert one doctrine, and then attempt to prove it by arguments in support of quite a different doctrine.

What Mr. Rupp, representing Nevinism, teaches in his article in the *Mercersburg Review*, and attempted, professedly, to defend in the *Messenger* is, as we have clearly shown by his own words, fairly quoted, that: *Regeneration is a conveyance, by emanation, of a portion of the substance of God to the centre of man's soul; that the channel through which that substance is conveyed, is baptism;*

*and that the substance so conveyed is the actual, literal, substantial germ and life-basis of the new life in the regenerate.*

On first reading Mr. R.'s promise or offer, to prove that this is really the doctrine of the Reformed church on the subject, and was actually taught in the Heidelberg Catechism and other Reformed Confessions, that leading, old Reformed theologians held and advocated it, &c., we thought: "Well, these disciples of Dr. Nevin are plucky, brave men, at any rate, and not afraid to undertake to prove anything." Dr. Nevin had the boldness to say, that the last clause in the answer to the 80th question of the Heidelberg Catechism (which pronounces the Romish doctrine of the Mass an accursed idolatry) was, in a sense, foisted in by the elector Frederick, against the wish of Ursinus, although Ursinus in his Commentary most earnestly supports and vindicates the curse pronounced in that clause. He, also, has tried to show that *Calvin's* doctrine of the Lord's Supper favored the idea of its being a sacrificial oblation, thus making it closely akin to the Mass.

So it seemed as though Mr. Rupp felt emboldened to undertake to prove that our Reformed Confessions and old theologians actually maintained and taught this Nevinite emanation theory touching regeneration by baptism.

Very well did we know that he could not succeed in the attempt any better than he had succeeded in a similar attempt to support his philosophical conceit by the Scriptures. It excited curiosity, however, to see how he would go about the effort.

Where, in the whole Catechism, was he to find a single phrase or word which, by any act of sophistry could be made most distantly to favor his view? In Tract No. 3, Dr. Gerhart had spent his utmost skill in dialectics and ambiguous phraseology to defend and prove that baptism was regeneration in any literal sense, and had failed. But here Mr. Rupp had to show that his *emanation* sense of baptismal regeneration was the true, though long-forgotten doctrine, of Reformed standards, and all genuine (echt) old Reformed doctors!

It was not necessary, however, to go far into the promised argument or proof, to discover that Mr. Rupp soon found himself balked by an impossibility. In all his long columns, devoted so boastfully to this grand point, he does not give one single sentence, clause, or word, in which anything at all approaching to the



Nevinite dogma of an organic conjunction of the Godhead, generically, with humanity, or of an emanation or transmission of the God-substance to the soul of man as the central life-germ of its being, or of baptism as the channel of such transmission, can be discovered.

He adroitly evades the whole thing.

So far as this point is concerned, therefore, there is nothing for us to refute. He has very kindly saved us the necessity of disapproving what he promised, and was bound by his position to maintain, but what he makes no effort to maintain in fact.

If ever he seriously thought that the monstrous view of his article, and school, could be supported by any honest quotations from Reformed authorities, he must very soon have discovered his mistake. So he abandons the attempt, and quietly substituted for his emanation-regeneration theory, the more current Romish, more Lutheran high-church doctrinal of

*Baptismal Regeneration,*

and labors to prove that *it* is the doctrine of the Reformed church.

Now, as we have said before, we are not bound by our undertaking to refute the Nevinite theory with which Mr. R. started out, to follow him in this evasion of the real point at issue. It is his duty, in the first place, to come out and frankly confess that his theory, however warmly he may hold and advocate it, is neither Scriptural nor Reformed.

But lest our refusal to follow him into his place of refuge might be misconstrued, we volunteer to meet him on the new ground to which he has run, and refute him there.

In direct and unequivocal opposition to Nevinism and Mr. Rupp, we affirm that baptismal regeneration, in any high-church sense, is

*Not a Doctrine of the Reformed Church.*

This can be proven :

1. By a general appeal to Reformed standards on the subject.
2. By special declarations, cited from Reformed Confessions and prominent theological writers.
3. By exposing the errors of Mr. Rupp in the quotations he gives, and the sense which he puts upon them.

First, then, we shall show what is the doctrine of the Reformed church upon this point, in a general view of it.

This requires us to ascertain at the outset, the

*Reformed Doctrine Concerning Regeneration.*

To begin with our standard Catechism, regeneration\* "consists in the mortification of the old and in the quickening of the new man."

The former is defined as "a sincere sorrow of heart, that we have provoked God by our sins, and more and more to hate and flee from them."

"The quickening of the new man," which may be considered as regeneration in the narrower and positive sense, is defined to be "a sincere joy of heart in God, through Christ, and with love and delight to live according to the will of God in all good works."

In explaining the doctrine thus set forth, *Ursinus* (whose Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism was declared, *twenty-three years ago*, by Dr. J. W. N., to be the best exposition of its meaning) makes such declarations as the following :

Regeneration consists "in a change of the corrupt mind and will into that which is good, produced by the Holy Ghost, through the preaching of the law and the Gospel."

*Ursinus* says, the second "part of conversion is called quickening, (1) because, as a living man performs the acts of one that is alive; so this quickening includes the kindling of new light in the understanding, and the producing of new qualities and activities in the will and heart, from which a new life and new works proceed."

In answer to a question concerning the causes and means of regeneration, he declares that "the Holy Spirit, or God Himself, is the chief efficient cause."

He declares "the means or instrumental causes" to be: (1) The law and Gospel; (2) faith; (3) and divine chastisements, as serving to contribute to the desired result.

As to the subject or matter in which it is grounded, *Ursinus* explicitly affirms it to be "the understanding, the will, the heart, and all the affections of man in which the change is wrought."

So much for *Ursinus*. Clearly, there is not the least trace of

\* It is well known that our old standard confessions and theologians used *conversion* and *regeneration* as convertible terms.

the Nevinite doctrine here. Would Mr. Rupp and Dr. T. G. Apple, echoing the *damno* of their master, pronounce this rationalistic heresy?

Not only is there *nothing* in the language of Ursinus to *favor* the new-order theory of regeneration. His explanation of the matter positively excludes the Mercersburg view; for if regeneration consists, as Ursinus teaches, in "kindling new light in the understanding, and the producing of new qualities and activities in the will and heart, by the Holy Ghost, through the law and the Gospel, and through faith," it follows necessarily that regeneration *does not consist in an emanation, or transmission, or conveyance of a portion of the substance of the Godhead, through baptism*, as Nevinism teaches it does.

As Ursinus explains regeneration, so we find it set forth and maintained in all subsequent Reformed Confessions and standard theological writings. Pages could be quoted to prove this from older and later authors. If needed, we will give such quotations hereafter. For the present let the following from *Shedd's History of Christian Doctrines* (Vol. II., pp. 164-167) suffice:

"The leading Protestant symbols adopt the Augustinian view of regeneration." The Augustinian view is, "The work of the Holy Spirit is necessary, not merely to supplement a deficiency in the power of fallen man, but to take the very initiative and *renovate* the will itself. \* \* The method of regeneration is this: The Holy Spirit is the efficient, the human spirit is the recipient. The consequence of the *divine efficiency* is *regeneration*; the consequence of the human recipiency is conversion. \* \* In this manner, *a will freely and firmly determined to holiness is restored again in man. By means of faith*, originated by prevenient grace, the divine spirit produces the consciousness of peace and justification through Christ's blood of atonement, *and imparts* a new divine life to the soul united to Christ."

We only add, as incidental testimony which may go for what it is worth, what Dr. S. R. Fisher says on the subject, in his "Exercises on the Catechism," (p. 167): "True conversion, a change of heart or disposition, succeeded by a reformation of life."

"Quickening, reviving, making alive." "New man, renewed nature; the *principle of holiness* implanted in the heart by regeneration."



"True conversion includes in it, also, the quickening of the new man, that is, our renewed nature."

The Reformed doctrine of regeneration, therefore, does not merely not include the Mercersburg view of the matter, but excludes it. Our standards not only know nothing of the emanation theory, but teach a doctrine which is directly antagonistic to it. The Mercersburg theory is not a fuller development of Reformed theology on this subject. It is a fundamental departure from it, and stands in irreconcilable opposition to it.

But to prove, as has been done, that the Mercersburg theory of Regeneration is un-Reformed and anti-Reformed, is to prove the same thing of its theory of baptism.

Here is the starting-point of the Nevinite error on this whole subject, the root of its bitterness. That cut, the bad tree must fall. Its theory of regeneration springs from its theory of God, and especially of God incarnate, as an organic conjunction of the substance of the being of the Creator with the creature. As this is pantheistic, so its doctrine of regeneration, by a logical consequence, is also pantheistic. And so Mr. Rupp shows it to be.

The advocates of this false theory need not rave at us for thus exposing it. Let them quietly prove that we have misapprehended or misrepresented them, and we shall gladly make the proper correction.

*P. S.*—It may, after all, be better to add a few more quotations to the proofs given above, and thus fortify our position against an artifice often used by the other side.

In the *Second Helvetic Confession*, it is said: "In regeneration the understanding is illumined by the Holy Ghost, so that it comes to understand the mysteries and will of God. Also, the will is not only changed through the Holy Ghost, but also endowed with faculties that it can and will fulfill the good."

That is, regeneration consists in a complete change, or renewal of man's personal will, understanding and heart, by the power of God the Holy Ghost. In this sense, and in this only, is it a new creation in Christ Jesus.

So, likewise, *Witsius* (III—VI, 4) defines regeneration as "a supernatural act of God by man, spiritually dead, a new and divine life is given, begotten of the incorruptible seed, the Word of God, by the infinite power of the Spirit."

And *Voetius* says: "Regeneration is an act of God in which he really changes them (that is, 'the called') from a corrupt state to a new and holy life, so that they may live according to God."

*Polander* defines regeneration as "a benefit of God in which our corrupt nature is begotten and restored in the image of God by the Holy Spirit, through the incorruptible seed of the Word of God."

## *The True Nature and End of Religion.* 471

In like manner the *Westminster Confession* (to which Mr. R. and others will occasionally deign to appeal when they think that the sound of its language may suit them) defines regeneration (under the usual title of effectual calling) as follows: "It is the work of God's almighty power and grace, whereby he doth, in his accepted time, invite and draw them (the called) to Jesus Christ by his Word and Spirit, savingly enlightening their minds, *renewing and powerfully determining their wills, &c.*"

To these proofs we will only add a few sentences from *Charnock* on regeneration. He says: "Regeneration is not a removal or taking away of the old substance or faculties of the soul. *Some have thought that the substance of Adam's soul was corrupted when he sinned, and therefore suppose the substance of his soul to be altered when he is renewed.* Sin took not away the essence (of the soul) but the rectitude; the new creation, therefore, gives not a new faculty, but a new quality."

Taking all this testimony together, we get the following result as the doctrine of the Reformed church on the subject, negatively and positively:

Regeneration is, first, Not effected by infusing into man a seminal portion of the substance of God, and so bringing him into organic conjunction with the very essence of the Godhead; but, second, A renewing of the very nature of man himself, of his mind, and will, and affections, by the power of the Holy Ghost operating directly upon the soul of man to this end.

This doctrine of regeneration excludes rationalistic pantheism on the one hand, and deistic or atheistic rationalism on the other hand.

We say rationalistic pantheism; for all pantheism is, at bottom, nothing but rationalism. That of Dr. Nevin and his school is, manifestly, only an attempt to explain the supernatural mysteries of grace by a rational or philosophical theory. And so, thinking themselves wise, they fall into folly.

---

## THE TRUE NATURE AND END OF RELIGION.

BY J. H. HUNSBERGER.

THE truth prominently taught in Scripture is, that religion influences every part of our nature. It is not an appendix to ourselves; not a thing to be adopted on special occasions, and laid aside at pleasure. But something that permeates our entire being, elevating, ennobling, and sanctifying all its parts.

The term religion, etymologically considered, signifies to bind back. Hence, religion re-unites man to his Maker; brings his whole being under the divine influence; subjects it to his loving control and guidance. It is the interrupted union between God and us restored, thus making human nature harmonious in all its parts

with the divine purpose. As through sin man revolted from God, and the powers of his being were no longer exercised in harmony with his heavenly will, but in accordance with the dictates of his own depraved nature, so religion brings man back to his original state, repairs the broken link in the great chain, restores the primitive harmony, and reinstates him in loving fellowship and communion with his Master.

Such is our explanation of religion ; such, we think and believe, is the Scriptural explanation of it. Those divine appointed means of grace, to the observance of which men's hearts are often enslaved—the reading of God's word, prayer, attendance on public worship, ceremonial and ritual observances—all of these, important and excellent as they are in their place, are *not* religion, but only means as its furtherance and promotion. These means of grace should be observed by all true Christians. But only so far as they are helps to religion and promotive of its best interests. To go no further in the divine life than merely to observe these outwardly, is to act on the same principle as the individual who, contemplating the construction of a building, would erect a scaffold for its construction, and then sit down and fold his hands, having the assurance within him that a great and magnificent structure will rise up of itself. You can readily see the absurdity of this. Oh, that only the church at large would see this serpent-like evil creeping within her pale. Oh, that she would awaken from her stupor and indifference to a proper sense of her duty and mission. May she heed the warning and save herself from the impending danger that threatens her very existence.

No man's religion can be estimated by the extent of his participation in religious worship. We must, first of all, know the effect it has upon his character and life before we can judge of its value. An individual prays much. Is that a proper criterion by which we may form an estimate of his character ? For we are not ignorant of the fact that prayer, so-called, may be merely the observance of a form, or a mechanical exercise, devoid of meaning, without a loving communion of the creature with the Creator. He communes much with his God apparently. Does it make him God-like ? He appreciates a sermon thoroughly imbued with the love of Christ. All very good. But does he try to exemplify his Lord's character by leading a holy and Godly life in his intercourse with his fellow-men ? Does he endeavor to become more Christ-



like? These are questions that will naturally arise. They should not be slightly passed over, but ought to be pondered over to see whether the Christian leads a consistent life—a life in strict conformity with his profession.

An individual is not religious who exhibits only a partial virtue—avoid some sins and indulges in others—is faithful in the performance of some duties, and wilfully neglects others. The power of religion cannot be thus partially shown. The religious man is not the one who is partially reformed, like putting a new patch into an old and well-worn garment without altering its texture, or strengthening it in general. The Christian's character is not patched up in that style. It is thoroughly renovated. He is a new creature. "Old things have passed away: behold, all things have become new."

See him in his relation to God. He endeavors day by day to bring his entire being into ready and loving submission to the requirements of the being whose authority and dominion is exercised over all the works of creation. He steadily attends upon the divine ordinances of the sanctuary; diligently and devoutly uses all the appointed means of grace, but not without a clear conception of their significance and purpose. His prayers are no longer the observance of forms merely, but the outpouring of his heart's desires to God. An exercise from which he never comes without having a character more refined and elevated in spiritual matters, and which will be a fountain continually sending forth streams of love which will beautify and bless the lives of all around him.

See him in his relation to men, and you will see that lofty character to be such as cannot be found unless acquired by close and intimate communion with God. This character is ever manifesting itself in acts of kindness and in deeds of love, wrought in the heart and fostered there by divine grace toward his fellow-men. As his love to God is inflamed, in view of his relationship to him, so must he be more ardent in the love cherished toward those with whom he has intercourse.

This is the religion the people of our day so greatly need—the only religion that will successfully meet the false doctrines so prevalent—doctrines advanced and promulgated by those even in the church who, instead of chief and true expounders of "holy writ" are, on the contrary, the most crafty and formidable of all

enemies against which the church must contend. The substitution of forms and ceremonies for religion has been attempted. What greater absurdity than this has ever been dreamed of? Its injurious effects are incalculable. History and observation alike bear testimony against its pernicious influence. It has been a clog to every progressive movement. It has arrayed against the true church the morality and intelligence of the world. It has raised the cry of persecution against the honest, noble-minded Christian men, because they would not conform to its rites and ceremonies. It has established the infidel the better in his unbelief, and forged the weapons of the skeptic. It is ruining the souls of men daily by persuading them that regular attendance on the worship of the sanctuary, the payment of a salary to the officiating minister or priest, and assisting in the erection of temples of worship, is all that is required.

The important duty now devolving upon us is, that we should inculcate principles and truths that will lead the minds of men into different and better channels of usefulness. How is this to be brought about? By teaching them to discard all outward forms of religion, as if they attained perfection in the spiritual life, and no longer needed the observance of these as incentives and helps, if properly used, in religion? By no means; but by promulgating this religion, which is fostered by divine ordinances into the whole world, so that all our trades and professions, brought under its benign influence, may thereby be reformed, and society in general be liberated from the fetters by which it is enchained.

Such Christian, however humble in life, may render very important service to the Redeemer's cause by assuming this position and acting accordingly. The world at large needs such men for its regeneration. The church calls long and repeatedly for them. She needs them to place it in a position of commanding influence in the world, so that she may thereby fulfill its mission. Oh, what a blessed day it will be when such men shall throng the gates and crowd the courts of Zion, shall plead her glorious cause throughout the world. Then will she arise and shine, and put on her beautiful garments; no more the scorn of infidels, or the tool of despots, but the bride of Christ, adorned with his beauty and strong in his strength." Glorious to look upon and powerful to act, men will be irresistibly drawn by her beauty and excellence to do her homage. Being thus panoplied with the whole armor

of God, she will march on conquering and to conquer, until the whole world is ransomed and brought to the feet of him who has purchased it with his own sacrificial blood.

---

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

To the three graduating orations published in our July and August numbers, the following two are added. The former was one of the Philosophical orations awarded :

### SHOW THYSELF A MAN.

BY J. A. STRASSBURGER.

To become great and famous is one of the strongest aspirations of the human heart. The love of distinction seems to be a constituent element of our nature; differing, it is true, in different characters. It is more or less active in every bosom. Whatever the condition in life, whatever the strength or peculiarity of other traits of character, whatever the moral and religious sentiments of the individual, we never fail to find in him from earliest childhood even, till life's latest consciousness, this susceptibility to the breath of fame. The young man, as he starts out in his course of life, endeavors to gratify this desire. A great name appears most worthy of his efforts, and in pursuit of it, health, character and happiness are voluntarily sacrificed. Our literature abounds in works whose sole aim is to stimulate this passion for distinction. The authors of these books select as their subjects men who have risen from humble positions in life to posts of honor and of trust. And from these exceptional cases, general principles are deduced which sometimes are as injurious as they are false. Because a man born on the frontiers of civilization, with few opportunities for culture, and no extraordinary capabilities, has made his way up through many opposing forces to an eminent position, no dreams of future greatness need disturb the dreams of other woodchoppers. Man was created in the image of his Maker; he is endowed with reason, and partakes of the divinity of his author; he essays to comprehend the mysteries of the universe—all that is above him and all that is below him; he usurps the government and control of animate and inanimate nature around him, presses their powers into his service, and makes them his willing slaves; he holds communion with infinite wisdom, and is emphatically an exponent of the divine mind. (Man ranks vastly above the animal in physical structure; and mentally where the animal gropes in darkness and vacuity, there man revels in the clear sunlight, and in worlds filled with everything that can bring happiness and joy. The distant bell sends forth its peal after peal;



the lowing herds listen with amazement; but to them the deep-sounding knell brings naught but a sound. In man it may awaken hope or despair, gladness or sorrow. The intellect makes man a rational being, endowed with powers which should be known and cultivated, in order that he may carry out the ends of his existence successfully.

Man possesses three great natures—the physical, the rational and the spiritual, which, in importance, are co-equal. Whatever injures any one of them has a bad effect upon the others. "A sane mind in a sound body is the perfection of life;" and a well-balanced whole conduces most effectively to well-being. Man, with these conditions of his being fulfilled, may reasonably hope to be able to accomplish the ends of his existence and work out a noble destiny. Only so far as he achieves those ends, and accomplishes his destiny, does he approximate the standard of real manhood. What greater incentive to virtuous action can the young man have than the desire to illustrate to the world, in his own character, the noble qualities of the true man. In this government, though "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," there are but too few in the full fruition of their undisputed birthright. It is put up at auction, and the highest bidder is the buyer. Some sell for a mess of pottage; others only when higher figures are offered. The most contemptible, however, are those who, by a slavish subservience to others, allow themselves to be made tools for mean work and corrupt purposes. The young are ever surrounded by such, who would extinguish every generous sentiment and break down all manly independence. In the race of life many, failing to achieve their own personal projects, join themselves to more successful schemes, and, by flattery, ingratiate themselves into favor, soon becoming adepts in all the arts of knavery, and use them to the accomplishment of base purposes. How often do those very institutions which are expected to foster the native genius and develop and strengthen the natural aptitudes of individual minds rather by their inexorable routine of training and their injudicious efforts to form all upon a common model, tend to repress peculiar talents, and leave the subject unfitted for the successful prosecution of any useful calling of life. (What signifies any amount of abstruse mathematics, imperfect knowledge of Latin, Greek and logic, crammed into a mind that rebels against it, as a boy's disordered stomach against an apothecary's dose. It is sad to see the amount of good material for artisans, mechanics and tradesmen that is annually spoiled by attempts to elaborate it into indifferent scholarship.) Our educational establishments seem to lose sight of the most important claims we have upon them—the fitting of young men and women for the practical every-day duties of real life. The young are taught to emulate the examples of great men, and in this way pernicious lessons are inculcated which so often result in ruin. We cannot all be distinguished for great ability and learning. We cannot all reach the positions which lie open to only the few. We cannot all attain to the highest honor, nor can all wear the laurel which is to deck but one brow. But we can all be good and virtuous and useful in the sphere we may be called to occupy. We can be men, and good men, even if we do not reach the summit of greatness or wealth. We can show true manhood even in the humblest call-

ings of life. Every man must make himself; and no man is made at all, unless he make himself. The quiet allotments of a peaceful life are more to be envied than the highest positions in the land. In the indiscriminate rush after distinction, rather than in a quiet progress towards the nobler possessions of mankind, many mistake their calling, and become second-rate men, who would be a credit to themselves and an ornament to society in positions suited to their intellectual capacities. Man cannot make of himself just what his wild fancy suggests; he must have adaptation to the calling he would follow; he must select what his endowments fit him for. This is exemplified in the various professions. In medicine we have quacks; in law, pettyfoggers; in the ministry, dolts. Why is it that old men, and men from middle life, are leaving useful industrial pursuits; and mere boys are hastening over their preliminary course of study to crowd the professions? "They hold out the promise of distinction and influence." These constitute the rings that control society—the aristocracy of republics, that receive homage from the sovereign people. There seems to be no disposition to master the humble callings, and give the world that assurance of the man which alone can ennoble the race. There seems rather to pervade a spirit which is leading us back step by step to the time when, to assert an opinion was a crime, and to act in an individual capacity sufficient cause for imprisonment and torture.

One word in regard to the class about to go out from this institution, and we shall commit it to its destiny, and in silence await the record it shall make for itself; yet, hoping that the principles of truth here inculcated may live longer than the class-tree which we planted on the Campus. Five young men are here associated together in academic pursuits, representing as many diversities of opinion as so small a number is capable of. They have now completed their course, but only to enter upon another in which the stern realities of earnest life, and life's work, will meet them at every turn, where no sympathy will be shown for mistakes, and no indulgence for tardiness. The responsibilities which rest upon us then are great, and by reason of our academic advantages more will be demanded of us. Upon us will rest in some degree the responsibility of making the reputation of the college we represent. This institution must depend for its reputation upon what it produces. If its products are good, such will be its reputation. If its products are bad, of necessary consequence such will be its reputation. Let us each then go forth to life's conflicts with the firm purpose, under all circumstances and upon all occasions, to show himself a man—a man fearless, independent, aggressive for liberty, for humanity, for right. In the words of fallen Woolsey: "Be just and fear not. Let all the ends thou aimest at be thy country's, thy God's and truth's. Then, if thou fallest, O Cromwell, thou fallest a blessed martyr."

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

*The Fall Term* of our new Academic year will have opened by the time these pages reach our friends. An unusually large number of applications has been made, and if a fair proportion of applicants come on, there will be a very

cheering increase in the several departments of our institutions. It is especially encouraging to note the fact, that so many of those who have entered our school during the past year, or of those who have recently applied for admission, expect to take a full course.

*In the Academic Department* the teaching force has been reconstructed and strengthened. Beside the principal, and the services performed in it by the regular professors of the College, there will be at least *three* well qualified assistants. *This Department is designed to supply the best facilities for a thorough English, practical education*, as well as to be a preparatory school for a complete College course.

*During the Summer vacation* very successful efforts have been made to procure funds for the College. In this respect, indeed, more has been done than during any previous year of our brief history. More than this need not be said at present. This much, however, may well serve to encourage the hearts of all our friends. And what has been thus accomplished, is not the result of any effort to make capital out of recent defections to Romanism from the new-order party. Doubtless, the painfully significant facts have had their influence. But what has been done for Ursinus, has been done on a broader basis.

*Heidelberg College*, Tiffin, Ohio, is vigorously prosecuting its work, and with cheering success. A large and commodious *boarding hall* has been erected for the accommodation of students, and will be ready for occupancy at the opening of the Fall session. This hall, under proper management, will be found of great advantage in many respects. After a trial of three years, we are more fully convinced than ever, that in this respect the plan of some of the oldest and best colleges in the United States, of having students under the constant domestic supervision of the faculty, as a family, is to be greatly preferred to the method of letting board wherever they please, and so be scattered through a large city or town. No supposed social advantages of this latter plan can compensate for its perils, or for the loss of the disciplinary advantages secured by the other plan.

Heidelberg College has been fortunate, also, in securing the services of so experienced a teacher as Prof. C. O. Knepper, of Waverly, Iowa, who has accepted a call to the Alumni Professorship, and will at once enter upon his duties.

*Acknowledgment of monies received for beneficiary education in Ursinus College:*

Heidelberg Reformed church, Philadelphia (additional).....	\$ 8 00
L. K. Graver, Plymouth, Montgomery county, Pa.....	2 00
Rev. E. J. Fogel.....	100 00
Trappe Reformed church.....	53 25
Friends in Alexandria, Huntington county, Pa.....	22 50
John Carson, Newburg, Pa.....	20 00
Rev. George Wolff, Myerstown, Pa.....	50 00
Rev. J. Sechler, Hanover, collected in his charge.....	50 00
Collected by Rev. W. D. C. Rodrock.....	27 42



URSINUS PERSONALS.

*Married*, in Reading, Pa., on June 28th, 1873, by Rev. H. Leisse, of Orwigsburg, Prof. J. A. Foil, late of Ursinus College, now of Newton, North Carolina, to Miss Sue C. Lantz, of Taneytown, Md., recently connected with Allentown Female College, Pa.

*During one of our vacation trips* we seized an opportunity of giving Rev. H. Leisse a short call at his home, and were glad to find him comfortably located and cheerfully at work.

---

EDITOR'S DESK.

*A duplicate July number*, was by mistake in the mailing office, sent to some subscribers instead of the August number. We regret the blunder and will cheerfully correct it.

This reminds us, however, of a still more serious mistake which many who receive the *Monthly* have been making for some time; *they have, through oversight or neglect, failed to pay up*. A miss in the mail is bad, but misses in such money matters are worse, at least for those who must pay the printer.

Please remember to remit by *check on a bank*, to our order, by *Postal money order*, on Philadelphia P. O., or by *Registered letter*. *And the sooner the better*.

In this business connection we add a word on another point. During the past few years a few subscribers have ordered *discontinuance whilst still in arrears*. *Our express terms make discontinuances in such cases optional with the Publisher*.

*All the back volumes* of the *Monthly*, from January, 1868, can be supplied to those desiring them. Price, \$1.50 per vol.; or, \$1.75 postage prepaid. Back single numbers also supplied at 20 cts. per copy, postage included.

*E. O. Forney's apostasy* has been very widely noticed in different parts of the State, and by the religious evangelical press generally. In some cases animated controversies have been excited by it. The more zealous abettors of Mercersburg theology have been so much vexed by the circulation of facts so damaging to their cause, facts which they wished to keep hushed, that they have hurled their vilest weapons at those who have dared to speak of the matter publicly, and draw attention to those facts. So bitter has been their irritation, and so violent their passion, that they have not refrained from uttering the most offensive and calumnious personalities. Their discretion has been so overpowered by their spite, that they did not see how much more they were exposing and harming their own miserable cause by this course, than those whom they sought thus malevolently to injure in their private character.

From some of those who indulged in such low logic nothing better was to be expected. A man, for instance, who would seek by gross misrepresentations

in a private letter, to injure the character of a brother minister, in order to prevent his being called to a charge which said man did want the brother to get, could hardly be kept by any nice sense of truth, or of right, from indulging malicious propensities in other cases.

But we were surprised at a betrayal of something very like this spirit in a *Reading* daily, over the signatures of brethren whom we have always accredited for a good measure of honorable feeling and high-toned integrity.

The more serious the charge which may be made against "certain persons," the more does common courtesy, or at least equity, demand that the accusation should be made in so open and frank a manner, that those struck at by the charge may have some fair opportunity of defending themselves.

On being made aware of the insidious assault in the *Reading* paper afore-said, nearly two weeks after its publication, the following communication was sent to the editors of the paper by way of reply. For local reasons, best known to themselves, they closed their columns against further controversy.

#### WHAT DO THEY MEAN?

FREELAND, Mont. co., Pa., August 19th, 1873.

*Editor Reading Times and Dispatch*—GENTLEMEN: Since my return from several weeks absence from home, my attention has been directed to the following statement published in your issue of August 6th, over the signature of several ministerial brethren of the Reformed church in your city:

*"For years certain disaffected persons, suffering from disappointed ambition, have studiously endeavored to create strife in the Reformed church, and having failed of success in Reading, where we have persistently determined to live harmoniously among ourselves, and in peace with the brethren of other denominations, the present moment has been seized as a seeming favorable opportunity to accomplish the malicious purpose so earnestly sought."*

This statement condenses, in a few bitter words, *personal* accusations of so serious a nature, that they should have been made less vaguely and more frankly than they are made.

The respected authors, for whom I have always cherished a personal regard, charge "certain persons" with a most heinous offence, or rather with several heinous offences.

That they do not mention the persons accused by name, renders the indictment all the more offensive. Could they have meant or wished to stab neighboring brethren of their own church in the dark, to assassinate them under cover of an ambiguous, sweeping charge?

Our past estimate of their character forbids the thought. And yet their bitter assertion, however undesignedly perhaps, must have this effect. Having allowed themselves to be induced to say as much as they have said, it is due to themselves, to the Christian public, and to those whom their broad, indefinite accusation might injure, to come out like men, and say more.

Whom do they mean when they refer to "certain disaffected persons, suffering from disappointed ambition," &c.? I know of quite a number of Reformed ministers and laymen who have openly opposed the Romish tenets and tendencies of

the so-called Mercersburg theology, and who have endeavored by fair and lawful means to warn the Reformed church against such pernicious influences and effects of that theology, as have been showing themselves in the apostasy of many of the ministers and members of our Reformed church! I know of a number of brethren, some residing in and not far from Reading, who have disapproved of the policy of hiding facts connected with that theology and its baneful workings from the people, and who have felt bound by duty to their church, their congregations, and their sacred office, to admonish their members publicly against the errors of that theology?

Among those who have been thus reluctantly constrained to do this, I may name the Rev. Dr. F. W. Kremer, of Lebanon; Rev. George Wolff, of Myers-town; Rev. Dr. Ziegler, Rev. J. Ziegler, and Rev. A. Wanner, of York; Rev. Dr. Helffrich and Rev. E. J. Fogel, of Fogelsville, not to name many more. I have done the same thing myself.

Do the Reading brethren, who have signed the above serious charge, mean to say that any of us are among "the disaffected persons, suffering from disappointed ambition?"

I ask this question, because I have been told that some cowardly calumniators are really trying to defend a bad cause, by circulating such defamatory falsehoods, secretly, and in a way which puts it out of our power to reach or correct their wicked slanders.

If the brethren who have published the statement containing the above hurtful allegations, do not mean any of the ministers named above, they will, of course, take the earliest opportunity of disclaiming such a purpose.

If they do refer to any of those named, under the misleading influence of some gross slander incautiously accepted, then as gentlemen and Christian ministers, they will also speak out plainly and say who are implicated in their charge, so as to afford the persons wronged a fair opportunity of refuting the slander.

Until they do this, they will be liable to be held as abettors of a vile calumny, or as the dupes of foul-tongued partisan malice.

Yours truly,

J. H. A. BOMBERGER.

*Dr. J. W. Nevin on Protestantism.*—Taking him at his own words, in their only obvious sense, Dr. Nevin, of Lancaster, has no better opinion of Evangelical Protestantism, and no more hope of it now than he had for years past. Quite recently, again, he has spoken out his mind freely on the subject in the *Mercersburg Review*, and in the *Reformed Church Messenger*.

His utterances in both cases are doleful and gloomy to an extreme degree. To his eye the prospect of Evangelical Christianity is covered with lowering clouds which forbade its speedy destruction. Its foundation rests in the loosest sands, and its superstructure, however showy and elegant in appearance, is but hay and stubble tied together with flimsy cotton cords. Its inner life lacks all the essential elements of a true vitality. Its fruits are apples rotten at the core. Its power is very impotence. And all its mightiest movements are but the spasmodic twitching or writhing of a dying Leviathan struggling against the workings of a mightier death which has fastened upon it.



Not only has Dr. N. no faith in Protestantism, and no hope of it. He seems to find a strange delight in brooding over what seems to him certain signs of its helplessness and rapidly approaching dissolution. His pen never writes so eloquently as when it describes what he regards as the misery and forlorn condition of our Evangelical Christianity. All his power of language, all his mastery of rhetoric, are employed in giving utterance to his despondency and despair.

Such is his unhappy state of mind on the subject, that he eagerly grasps at every thing which exhibits Protestantism in a discouraging light. An editorial of this sort appeared some time ago in the *Christian Advocate*, a Methodist paper published in New York. On most other subjects Dr. N. would have treated an article from that source with contempt. But the doleful editorial was just the thing for his morbid mind. Like a moral hypochondriac he wants to sigh, and groan, and lament, and turns as by electric affinity to whatever serves to make him cry and weep. Out of humor, out of heart, with regard to entire Evangelical Protestantism, he eats with eager appetite all things unfavorable to it which come in his way.

After Jonah had predicted the downfall of Nineveh, he wished to see its destruction, and would have hailed with gladness any indications of its gathering doom. And when the Lord reversed that doom, Jonah was sore displeased; for he would thus seem to have been a false prophet.

Accordingly, Dr. N. promptly laid hold of the *Christian Advocate* article, had it republished in full (we suppose) in the pliant *Reformed Church Messenger*, (always ready to serve the bad cause), and added notes of his own equal about in length to the article, in which he endorses the Methodist editor's lamentings over the decline of Protestantism.

The main purpose of the "notes" appended to the copied article, appears to be to vindicate previous attacks upon Protestantism by the author of the *notes* or his school.

But how significant that the eyes which so eagerly read the article in the New York *Christian Advocate*, did not see or care to read the half-dozen or more replies to it, or to similar morbid misrepresentations of Protestantism, elsewhere published. Such replies were made in the *Christian Intelligencer*, in the New York *Observer*, the New York *Times*, the *Methodist* (a far more ably conducted journal than the *Advocate*), &c. Why were *they* not read and noticed? They were full, fair and convincing exhibitions of facts, which proved that the *Advocate* was utterly mistaken and unjust.

There was, however, no taste for them. *They* (those replies) were not to the purpose of Dr. Nevin and the *Messenger*. Anything to run down evangelical Protestantism, or discourage some of its faint-hearted friends and cheer on its many foes, appears to be welcome; but facts and vindications, which serve to confirm and inspire with courage those clinging to the old apostolic faith, are ignored or suppressed.

In illustration of the view which Dr. N. continues to take of Protestantism, and of the disparaging way he can still write about it, we give the following extract from the April number of the *Mercersburg Review*:

"What a thought that Christianity has conquered as yet no more than a third of the world's population;<sup>1</sup> that Buddhism is both *older*<sup>2</sup> and in numbers stronger; that Islamism, the *paralysis of nations* (the italicizing is ours), *is still going ahead*<sup>3</sup> of it in the work of new conversions; and that now, when the highway of commerce and travel is opened into all the dark places of the earth, it has so little power to irradiate them with its own light! For, alas, our missions, whether Catholic (*i. e.* Romish) or Protestant, are not taking any effectual hold upon the world's heathen life.<sup>4</sup> They are at best but a sort of colonized Christianity . . . *hybrid births*, we may call them, in the bosom of that life, that belong to it, after all, only in an outward manner, and so have no capacity for propagating themselves (by a native ministry for example<sup>5</sup>) in any truly independent way. And why is all this? There can be but one answer. It is owing to the fearful dismemberment of the Christian church. What hope can there be for any whole evangelization of *India*; for example, through a *dozen* different denominational agencies, practically opposing one another in their conceptions of what Christianity is, and each trying to draw converts to itself in the *weak piping voice of a miserable, separate merely human sect?*" "*Our*

<sup>1</sup>To expose the sophistry of this sort of rhetoric we will also add a few brief notes. And, in answer to this point say:

What a thought, that after a ministry of three years, and such a ministry as the world never enjoyed before or since in such a form, the Lord Jesus Christ should have won so few disciples? That His immaculate life, and mighty works and preaching should have had no more effect than was shown when the multitudes who had seen and heard Him, cried out, "away with Him, crucify Him;" and that even after the day of Pentecost there should have been in all Israel, only 5,000 professing disciples. And so we might go on through the Acts of the Apostles, to the end of the Revelation.

But what miserably deceitful logic this would be, and unworthy of any one pretending to be learned, and of sound judgment.

<sup>2</sup>Does Dr. N. mean to set it down to the reproach of modern Protestantism that the Christianity which it is toiling to maintain and promote, is no *older* than it is? If not, there is no sense in his comparison of Protestantism with Buddhism. If he does mean this, then again there is no sense in it, for how can modern Protestantism be held responsible for the fact that Christianity is only 1800 years old? But why did not Dr. N.'s favorite third and fourth century Christianity conquer Buddhism? What is all such talk but the effervescence of gas-rhetoric?

<sup>3</sup>"Islamism going ahead!" This must be a typographical error. We can hardly think that Dr. N.'s most ardent and blinding zeal could betray him into such a blunder. Where is Islamism going ahead of Protestantism in the work of new conversions?

<sup>4</sup>"For alas, &c.," "Catholic (he means, as we intimate in parenthesis, Romish) or Protestant." Dr. N. puts both on a par, he has no more faith in Protestantism than in infallibility Popery. At the same time what he says bears most heavily against Protestantism, as the following sentences show:

"Are not taking hold, &c." O that some one would keep Dr. N. supplied with foreign missionary intelligence and statistics. Such *little* items as the following might cast a ray of moonlight, at least, across his dark and starless sky:

"The total Christian population of *Lower Bengal* is now ascertained to be 93,098. Of these more than 70,000 are Asiatics, 50,000 are natives of Bengal, a little over 20,000 are persons of mixed blood born in the country, and 20,000 are Europeans. *A native church of 70,000 members does not seem a very inadequate result of seventy years of missionary enterprise in a single governorship.*

<sup>5</sup>"Native ministry," and yet nearly 1000 native converts to Christianity are now employed in Asiatic missions alone, where thirty years ago there was hardly one.

*Protestant sects*,<sup>6</sup> it is unnecessary to say, are also plainly unequal in their sect character to the task of restoring Christianity to *its true and proper* form and power. With all the sense there may be among them of the wrong and misery of our church divisions, still it is not in their nature, *as sects*, to seek honestly an end of those divisions in the way of genuine Catholicity; as they have not in them either *as sects* the power of doing anything effectual toward bringing such Catholicity to pass. And the consequence of all this, as may be easily seen, is a growing impotency among them in their own abstract order of existence, *each coming to be more the outward form and shell only of what it was in the beginning. Thus, they are also judged of God, and found wanting.* But of this we will speak no farther at present." (*Mercersburg Review*, April, 1873, pp. 286, 288-89.)

What words to come from such a source! And he could have it in his heart to say more of the same sort, but, either in pity or disgust, forbears!

Such dismal and detractive delineations of Evangelical Christianity, of which Protestant sects, as Dr. N. contemptuously says, are the only true representatives we have met with before. But they ran from the leprous hearts and pens of avowed enemies of the Gospel. They were caricatures of Christianity, drawn by foes who cared not to hide their hostility.

In this case the picture is painted by a right hand, pledged most solemnly to the maintenance and defence of our holy cause!

What shall we say to all this? Shall we reiterate the triumphant refutations of such false and injurious assertions, which have been published hundreds of times?

It may be a question whether Dr. Nevin is more to be blamed or pitied for indulging such views and giving utterance to them. There is certainly room for severe censure. The representation given of Evangelical Protestantism, is unjust and injurious. Facts in abundance are within reach of every intelligent Christian, which prove the opposite. The cause of God is not resting upon our work. Though the faith, the love and zeal of Evangelical Christians are not what they should be (when were they, in a *perfect* sense?) there is earnest zeal, sincere love, and some strong faith in every one of the condemned "*sects*." In many places the "Word of the Lord" is having free course and being glorified. Since the days of early Apostolic Christianity, the Gospel has never made such rapid progress, in home and in heathen lands, as during the present century. Never, since those earliest times, did Christianity exhibit as much vitality and Gospel power as it has been displaying for the last sixty years. And a professing Protestant writing upon this subject, should know that this is so. If he does not know it, if his time and mind have been mainly absorbed with other studies, until he has become morbid, he should not write. The world, Christi-

<sup>6</sup>"Our Protestant sects." Here we have it, plainly enough; this is what the writer desires to make most prominent. What does he mean? Evidently the several branches of the Reformed church, &c.; our own, our sister Reformed church, the Presbyterian church, the Lutheran church, Congregationalists, the Methodists, &c., &c., all are mere miserable piping *sects* in Dr. Nevin's estimation, of which he feels prompted by the feelings of his heart, and the state of his mind, to speak only in such terms of contempt! Why stay among such sects?



anity would not suffer, if he kept his morbid feelings to himself. And he may be thought deserving of heavy blame for not doing so.

Besides, it may be said, all such misrepresentations must have a most hurtful effect upon all who may be under the influence of Dr. Nevin's views and tuition. The feeling which prompted their utterance must, more or less, shade all his instructions, and taint his special work. For this reason it may be thought reprehensible to have indulged in such a strain of *eloquently* disparaging criticisms.

And yet there is room for profound pity, too. A man who sees only gloom amidst sunshine, and has no heart or voice for anything but sighs, and groans, and denunciations, where so much is being manifestly done to advance the cause of the Redeemer, may well be allowed to merit some commiseration. Whilst he was penning those dolefully disparaging sentences, angels in heaven were rejoicing over sinners repenting, and lost sheep returning to the fold of the good Shepherd. But he could only sigh and groan over imaginary desolations! Through the efforts of the despised *sects*, thousands were being gathered from the East and the West, from the North and the South, from Africa and the islands of the sea, but he could not see it for blinding tears, or hear the good tidings for the noise of his own moans.

And all because things are not according to his mind!

One in such a state is to be heartily pitied, as well as heavily blamed!

Nor can this misery seem to be much relieved, if we consider *his only hope* for the church and the world, amidst this wide-spread ruin and helplessness.

What is Dr. N.'s hope? "The old Catholic movement" of Europe. That he says, "carries in it a bow of hope and promise for the world?" He further says that "*God's signature* is upon the movement."

What a wretched, speckled bow of promise, indeed. *Old Catholicism* may do some good by breaking up the moral and spiritual stagnation of the Romish church. But it must be remembered that it is far from being a Reformation movement like that of the sixteenth century. At best it is only Popery, without the Pope, or rather, without Papal infallibility. It clings warmly to all the doctrinal errors and "ritualistic mummery" of Popery.

But by it Dr. N. thinks the world is to be saved! No, not that either, confidently. He allows that it may in the end "come to nothing more than to teach a great lesson on Christian union!"

And what then? Evangelical Christianity gone; Döllingerism run down; old Popery defunct; what then to hope in?

Nothing—so far as our author can see or say; absolutely nothing!

Oh! to what a wreck of faith and hope the human heart and mind can come, which yields to the gloomy influence of mists and vapors which its own unhappy broodings have gendered.

"*Unfaithful sons abusing their mother*," is the cry of some who are always ready to denounce, with bitter calumnies, those who are exposing and resisting the ritualistic Romish movement in our Reformed church. They accuse us of assailing the church, maligning the church, trying to injure and destroy the church.

How is this? It is a matter which may need a little examination.

Who or what constitutes the Reformed church? Are E. E. Higbee, D. Gans, I. E. Graeff, G. H. Johnson (of Easton), T. G. Apple, and others of their mind—are they the Reformed church? Is Mercersburg theology, with all its Romish crotchets, the Reformed church? Is the Mercersburg new-order of worship the Reformed church, or the *Mercersburg Review*? Is it our confession of faith?

We have never so understood it. No Synod has ever, constitutionally or otherwise, declared them to be such. No Synod has ever been asked to do so, in any fair, open, explicit way. The inventors and advocates of the new theology, have never laid before any Synod a definite, summary statement of their peculiar tenets for careful examination, and for approval or rejection. Either policy, or fear of the result, has kept them from doing so.

At the General Synod of Dayton they very plainly declared, that no endorsement of Mercersburg theology, so far as it might be contained in the new-order of worship, was sought or desired. The whole matter, with all it involved, was to be left open for further consideration and discussion.

And yet strenuous and most unfair efforts are made to produce the impression, that all who speak or write against the new theology, are fighting against the church! That every article which sets forth the false character of that theology, the Romanizing tendency of the school which has produced, and which teaches and defends that theology, is an assault upon the church.

If a disciple of that school carries out its principles, and acts consistently by apostatizing from our church to Rome, and the fact, with the causes of it, is announced, published—immediately the howl is heard—they are defaming the church!

What is this but a miserable trick, a shameful device to turn attention from the true evil and its cause to something else, in order to blind and deceive the people. It is, in spirit and fact, just what Ahab tried, when he charged Elijah with being a troubler in Israel, in order to excite popular indignation against him. It is what certain priests of a later date attempted against Jeremiah, who laid bare and denounced their perversions of the truth.

It is what, at a still later date, the Jewish high-priest and his abettors, with certain Pharisees did, when the apostles exposed the errors of their vain traditions, substituted for the true doctrines and commandments of God. It is what Popery did with Huss, and Wickliffe, and Zwingle, and Luther, and all the noble advocates of the pure Gospel, in opposition to the abominable perversions of that Gospel which Popery favored and upheld.

We are not ignorant of such devices. The people, the true church is not ignorant of them. And though, for a time, some may be thus deceived, the deception will not long succeed.

No. Drs. Higbee, Apple, &c., are not the Reformed church. Their whole party is not the Reformed church. To expose and denounce the errors they may hold and teach, is not rebellion, sedition, or contumacy against the church. It is presumptuous arrogance in them, and worse, to claim that they constitute the Reformed church, and that opposition to them is opposition to it.

They may rave as they please about it. They may shake their wands in sol-

emn threatenings. None of their noise or threatenings shall disturb those to whom the church of their fathers is dearer than the party which is striving by some of the most censurable means to usurp the power of the church, and by it strike down all resistance to their revolutionary schemes.

That party can't do what it pleases and *command* the true sons and daughters of the church to be silent, and supinely acquiesce in their measures. There are tongues which will not be silent. There are pens which will write. There are hands which will be lifted up against such treacherous innovations. If they dare to teach and preach what they please, however contrary to our standards of faith, others may stand up and expose their errors.

"Abuse our mother!" because *they* are offended at the hindrances placed in the way of their perverting schemes! Not a bit of it. The Rev. Drs. Higbee and T. G. Apple, and the Rev. G. H. Johnson, are not our mother, as we may well be thankful to know.

Our new-order theology advocates may fancy themselves, vainly, to have all the profound learning, and power of logic, &c. on their side. They have a very self-complacent way of assuming this. But truth and right are mightier even with but "the jaw-bone of an ass" for their weapon, than error and wrong with all the whetted swords and bristling spears of the Philistines.

Opposition to Mercersburg theology has sprung from love for the church, and for the cause of Gospel truth and grace in Jesus Christ, which our church represents. That theology is rejected and resisted because it is believed to be subversive of the faith and destructive of the true life of the church. We love the old faith more than the new fiction, the old staunch life of the church more than the ritualistic shams which Mercersburg seeks to substitute for it. And shall those who do so be decried as abusers of their mother for doing it.

And how much do they, who raise this cry, really care for the Reformed church? Let their whole course answer. That course plainly enough proves that their chief interest in the church lies in the hope that the church, with all pertaining to its present organization, may be used as ready means for carrying the measures of their new theology and its kindred ritualism. It is asserted, even, that some of the more zealous adherents of those measures have declared that if the Reformed church did not give them the ritualism they want, they would go to Rome. How many are of this mind we cannot say. It is to be feared, however, that there are more than is now dreamed of by the church at large.

Denouncing Mercersburg theology, we repeat, is not enmity to our church, but a proof of firm and warm attachment to it. And this is coming to be better understood, as the people everywhere are learning more fully what that theology is, and to what it naturally leads.

*Another fraud* is attempted by the effort to make people believe that opposition to Nevinism is confined mainly to the alleged seditious efforts of one, two or three persons, ministers of the church. This is another favorite party-cry of those who are trying to force the innovations upon the church. Of course they know that the charge is false. Still they hope to make it serve their purpose.

To show its falsity, only consider a few simple facts:



1. In the East there are at least seventy *ministers* who avow dissent from Mercersburg theology, and opposition to it; not to count many who do not fully endorse it.

2. In the West the number of those who favor it, is exceedingly small; the *great majority* of the ministers, both the Ohio and North-western Synods, being decidedly opposed to it.

3. Turning to the *membership of the church* at large, it may be safely asserted, that notwithstanding the insidious efforts to inoculate them with the new doctrine, scarcely one in twenty, or even in thirty, would accept the doctrine if it were fairly and fully explained to them.

And yet every effort is made, in the *Messenger* and elsewhere, to produce the impression that but for two or three men, the church is a unit with Mercersburg theology. Dr. Fisher knows better. The professors at Lancaster know better. Every General Synod has given proof to the contrary.

Such chaff will hardly catch many birds!

*Let none be misled* by recent assaults upon Popery, made in the "*Mercersburg Review*" and the "*Messenger*." They may sound, indeed, as though our Lancaster friends were entirely changing their mind, and taking a new and favorable turn. It is to be carefully noted, however—

1. That the assaults are made expressly, *not against the errors and superstitions* of the Romish church as a whole. But—

2. Only or mainly against "the tyranny of Rome," and the infallibility dogma. It may seem rather strange, and so it is, that the Mercersburg advocates of high-churchism should denounce the ecclesiastical tyranny, or clamor against the usurpations of the Papal hierarchy. According to their theory, the organization of the visible church is not complete without a visible head—a Pope; and what is a Pope worth if he is not supreme and infallible?

But we have carefully noted the fact, that in all that the leaders of the high-church party have to say against the Pope's arrogant and blasphemous claim of infallibility, they are still quite silent in regard to other equally anti-Christian and pernicious doctrines and practices of the Romish church. They have not changed their ground on any essential points of error heretofore advocated.

*Like most other periodicals* open to articles on various subjects related to their general aim, the REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY receives and admits some, to all the sentiments of which the editors do not wish to be understood as giving their unqualified endorsement. And, as in the case of most periodicals, statements may occasionally get into their columns or pages which, had they been noted, would probably have been modified or suppressed; so with the MONTHLY.

Our attention has been recently called to a statement of this kind, which appeared many months ago, reflecting, it is said, unjustly on the party referred to, by insinuating that he dispensed absolution for a price. Had the statement or insinuation, in its personal bearing, been observed, we should not have admitted it; and now desire to express regret at its appearance.

## BOOK NOTICES.

THE *Report of the Bureau of Education* (United States) has been received through the politeness of John Eaton, esq., Commissioner. It is a volume of more than ten hundred compact pages, and contains an immense amount of most valuable information. Large as the mass of matter is which fills the volume, it has been so skillfully arranged, that its facts are placed within easy reach of all who are interested in the subject. Mr. Eaton and his assistants deserve high commendation for the admirable manner in which they have done their arduous duties.

FROM *Sheldon & Co.*, 677 Broadway, New York :

"*Moral Philosophy, or the Science of Obligation.*" By James H. Fairchild, President of Oberlin College.

This is among the latest American text-books of moral science. In its method and style it is marked by qualities which merit commendation. The second part, which treats of practical ethics, especially, possesses many excellencies. Under the first part, also, theoretical ethics, we were glad to find a frank, and, in the main, fair criticism of the various "theories of obligation," as the author styles them, which have been, or are now, advocated.

But we cannot endorse his own, which is, essentially, that of President Mark Hopkins, viz: The theory of "benevolence as comprehending all virtue, and having its formation in the immutable nature of things." The fallacy and error of this principle, as well as the evil results to which it must lead, were ably, though very kindly, exposed by Dr. McCosh, of Princeton, in his letters to Dr. Hopkins on the subject.

"*The Heidelberg Teacher*, and Lesson Papers for Sunday-schools," for September and October has been issued, and by its contents proves itself worthy of its growing patronage.

"*The Scholar, for Young People*," June, 1873, has been received, and seems admirably suited to instruct and please those for whom the monthly is designed. Published by Adams & Co., 133 South Clark street, Chicago. Edited by Selim H. Peabody. Terms \$1.20 a year. To clubs of 10 or more it will be furnished at 80 cents each.

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

PERSONAL items are necessarily omitted in this number, excepting the announcement of the sudden death of the *Rev. John W. Hoffmeier*, of Manchester, Md., of which the sad tidings just reached us as the closing pages of this number were being written. Particulars will be given in our next issue.

*Divisions of Classes, &c.*—There seems to be extraordinary and significant zeal manifesting itself, recently, in this direction. Not only are new Synods being organized, but this movement is rapidly followed by efforts to divide old Classes and form new ones. Neither is this movement limited to large Classes, which had become unwieldy and inconvenient. The comparatively small Classis of Goshenhoppen has been affected by it. Quite recently, after some previous unsuccessful efforts, that Classis took action, by which the district heretofore covered by it will fall under two Classical bodies. This is the more noteworthy from the fact that heretofore the Classis has complained of being shut in by confines too narrow, so that it was kept discouragingly small.

If Goshenhoppen Classis has found it expedient to divide, the question of like action in other cases might be worth pondering.

*Frederick City, Md.*—An election was recently held in the Reformed church of Frederick, made vacant by the death of the lamented Dr. Zacharias. The candidate in nomination was the Rev. T. G. Apple, D.D., of the Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa. The result of the election was twenty-five for the nominee, and fifty-eight against him. This result was probably quite unexpected to the friends of the candidate, and not to be attributed to private personal considerations.

*The dedication services* of a new Union church in Pleasant Valley, Monroe county, Pa., took place on Sunday, August 17th. The old church, which had for a period of seventy years served to call the worshippers to the service of God, gave way to a tasteful structure, costing, with bell and organ, over \$10,000. The amount needed had been previously nearly subscribed, leaving only a few hundred dollars to be collected at the time of dedication, and which was promptly subscribed. The building, which is seventy by fifty feet, occupies a favorable position, and may be seen at a considerable distance on several sides of the valley. On Saturday services were held in German, by Rev. L. K. Derr, of the Reformed; and Struntz, of the Lutheran church. On Sunday morning Rev. Struntz preached in German, and Rev. A. R. Horne in English. The dedication service proper took place on Sunday afternoon—the pastors (Weber and Becker) officiating, followed by a sermon in English, by Professor H. W. Super, of Ursinus College. The Reformed pastor of this charge, Rev. C. Becker, has served it faithfully for nineteen years.

Foreign delegations to the Evangelical Alliance have already commenced to come over. Rev. Dr. Parker, the well-known London preacher among the Congregationalists, is on his way, and, to follow him in time, the Dean of Canterbury, and Professors Perowne and Leathes are expected, as representatives of the Church of England: Drs. Cairns, Eadie, Brown, Rainy and others, from the Scotch Presbyterians; Drs. Arthur and Riggs, of the Wesleyans; Pastor Bersier and Dr. Pressense of the church in France; Pere Hyacinth and others from Switzerland, Germany, and elsewhere.



WM. PAINTER & CO.,  
BANKERS,  
No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF

GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

---

Gold, Stocks and Bonds

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE  
PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.

---

## MORNING SUNBEAMS

For the playroom, Schoolroom, and Nursery. Selected by Mrs. E. Prentiss for the little folks, to hang on their chamber and schoolroom walls, like the "Silent Comforter" in hospitals, and furnish a divine talisman for every day. Folio. 32 pp. 75c.; post. 10c.

## PRAYER.

A new and attractive devotional manual, containing suggestions and hints from our best writers, on the Lord's Prayer, and prayer in general. 104 pp. large 32mo. 20c.; post 4c.

## THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT.

Lessons from Christ's conflict and victory. By Rev. A. F. Dickson. The teacher of youth, the tempted and the troubled Christian, will find it valuable. 144 pp. 18mo. 40c.; post 8c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISELL,

1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

FALL TERM. 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The FALL TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, commences Monday SEPTEMBER, 1, 1873, and continue sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

WILLIAM H. SNYDER, Instructor in the Academic Department.

J. G. NEFF, Tutor.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

VOL. VI.—OCTOBER, 1873.—No. 10.

DISCOURAGING THE HEART

OF God's people is set down in His Word as a most grievous sin. How this may be done, the hurtful influence of such discouragement, God's great displeasure with it, and the peril of committing the sin—all are impressively set forth and illustrated in the *case of the ten spies* sent out by Moses to explore the land of Canaan, and report the result of their explorations. (Numbers 13: 17, &c.)

*Twelve* chosen men were sent out for this purpose. *Two* of the twelve are honorably named as having brought back a truthful but cheering report. They were, Caleb and Joshua.

The other *ten*, however, brought back a different report. They did not tell unmixed falsehoods. Neither did they say what they themselves, perhaps, did not believe. It seems that they really viewed the case as they reported it, and felt what they affirmed.

But whilst much of what they said was true, and agreed with the testimony of Caleb and Joshua, they added to it things which were calculated to make false and hurtful impressions. They greatly misrepresented the case. In this way they sorely discouraged the heart of the people.

That they did this, *in some sense* truthfully, may also be admitted; that is, they seem really to have seen things in Canaan as they said they saw them, and were troubled and alarmed in their own souls by the discoveries they made.

For this, however, they had themselves to blame. It was their own fault that they were in a state of mind to be so much terrified



and disheartened by some of the things they had seen. And it was their sin and shame, also, to be so affected by them.

It proved that they had no right faith in God, and none in His cause. God had said that He would give the land of Canaan to the children of Israel. "With a mighty hand and a stretched-out arm" He had led them forth from Egypt for this very purpose. Many proofs had been given them, both of His faithful purpose to do what had been promised, and of His power to do it.

If, therefore, those ten men had believed God, and had cherished proper confidence in His cause, they would have seen things with other eyes, and would have come back with other impressions and a very different story.

Their unbelief and alarm were their reproach and sin. Accordingly the Lord held them responsible for what they felt and said, and sorely punished them. They "died by the plague before the Lord." (Numbers 14: 37). And this judgment fell upon them *because "they had discouraged the heart of the people."*

For *the effect* of their evil report was great and most injurious.

*They stood ten to two.* People are very apt to be taken by numbers. Those false spies could say, against the testimony of Caleb and Joshua: Are those two men more likely to be right than we ten? Do you not know us as well as them? Are we not your brethren, and have we not always borne a good name among you? May they not have some ambitious or other wrong motives in presenting matters in so favorable a light? Do we lie, and only they speak the truth?

All this would sound very plausible. Surely, ten witnesses are rather to be believed than two! Especially so if the ten were prominent men in Israel, and had those among the people who would side with them, and try to get the people to believe the report of the ten, instead of taking that of two such men as Caleb and Joshua!

At any rate they did succeed for the time in carrying most of the people with them. The ten became heroes, and the two came near being stoned to death, under the hissing of those ten.

They succeeded, however, only for a time. (The triumphing of the wicked is short). And they did so to their own ruin, and to the unspeakable harm of those who gave heed to their false report.

The occurrence made a deep impression on the entire subse-

quent history of Israel. It is several times referred to, as in Numbers 32, 9, nearly fifty years after the event happened; in Deuteronomy 1: 28, and probably in some of the Psalms. The great point made in all these notices of the case is, that the persons condemned were *guilty of having used their influence to discourage the hearts of the people of God, by falsely representing to them the condition of things in Canaan.*

In this the ten spies did harm in several ways.

1. They made the people *personally* unhappy. The alarming accounts which they brought back were calculated to shake personal confidence in God and in His promises. This bad effect soon showed itself in the distress and terror which seized many of the people. In thousands of hearts faith failed, and most discouraging unbelief took its place.

2. This was quickly followed by a *general panic* in the camp. The alarm spread like fire, and throughout all the tribes could be heard cries of terror and lamentation.

And no wonder that this should be so. If the report of the ten was true, the people of Israel were indeed in a sad plight. They could not abide in the wilderness and make that their national home. It afforded no fit place for a permanent habitation. They were afraid to go forward into Canaan, for they felt unequal to the powerful, giant soldiers which were said to abound there, and to be ready to drive back any who might venture to enter their country. And could they think of going back again to Egypt, and once more bow their necks to the yoke of galling slavery from which they had been so lately rescued? This seemed a bitter alternative, but the only chance left for saving their lives.

What a situation, what a state of mind and heart for those to be in who had been favored with so many impressive and cheering proofs of Jehovah's presence among them, and of His purpose and power to fulfill all He had promised to them! That such a people should be tempted to think for a moment of turning back again to the bondage and darkness of Egypt! And yet they did. So fully had the ten messengers succeeded in discouraging their hearts. By their falsely exaggerated accounts, those spies had made the people "forget the doings of God, and His wonders which He had showed them. They forgot the marvellous things He did in the sight of their fathers, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan."

And so the people clamored to return to Egypt. It is quite possible that the ten spies wished to produce this very effect. For reasons of their own *they* may have become dissatisfied with the journey and its trials. They themselves had no longer proper faith in the mission of Israel, or in the Lord's way of leading His people onward to the accomplishment of that mission. Hence, they may have desired to create dissatisfaction and mistrust.

It is quite possible, too, that for reasons of their own, those spies may have wished to return to Egypt. Some things in Egypt may have been more to their mind than what they saw and possessed in the desert, or than what they expected to find in Canaan. And they may have thought that the surest way of securing what they (the ten spies) wanted, was to get the people disheartened and stirred up to cry out against their situation, and to turn their faces towards Egypt. The ten, much as they wished to go back, did not want to go alone. *Perhaps shame prevented them; or they could not have persuaded their wives and families to go with them; or they shrank from losing their offices and its gains.* Many such reasons may have been in their way.

But if they could work upon the masses of the people, and get the multitude to go with them, all would come right for them.

3. Thus were the people not only "discouraged in their hearts," but tempted to sin a great sin against God, and bring down His just displeasure upon them.

Other similar points suggest themselves, but these must suffice, and naturally turn from them to some

#### *Lessons of the Case,*

bearing directly upon the situation of things in Evangelical Christianity, and perhaps especially upon our own church. There are those among us, who have in some sense been repeating the wrong and folly perpetrated by the ten spies. At least they have done so, and are doing so in the spirit of the thing. They have been trying to raise and to spread

#### *False Alarms*

against Protestantism, especially against Evangelical Protestantism. By these false alarms, exaggerations of real evils, the invention of imaginary evils, and gross misrepresentations, they have been striving for years to undermine and destroy faith in our



doctrines, our worship, our principles and our cause. They have caricatured and defamed the oldest, most respected, and most evangelical of our Protestant denominations, as

*Sects,*

mere sects; and as such, held them up to reproach and to contempt. The Reformed, Presbyterian, Lutheran, Congregationalist, Episcopal (Protestant) churches, and all others, are only *miserable sects*. As such they have been exposed to public ridicule, as powerless, impotent, and utterly unable to carry on the work of the Gospel in any effectual way. Every thing that could be turned to account, for shaking and destroying faith in them, has been diligently used for the purpose.

*Evangelical Protestant Missions*

have been disparaged and ridiculed. The missionary efforts of Evangelical Christianity have been placed in contemptuous contrast with Mohammedanism, and with Buddhism, which are ignorantly and falsely declared to be carrying on their bad work more successfully than Protestantism. The preaching of evangelical missionaries to the heathen, is pronounced "the piping voice of a miserable, separate, merely human sect," because, forsooth, those missionaries do not succeed any better than the Apostles did, in persuading the great masses, to whom they may preach, at once to embrace the Lord Jesus Christ and His saving grace.

The ruling faith of Evangelical Protestantism is calumniously denounced as being no better than a

*Bald Rationalism,*

which ignores or rejects everything supernatural, objective and divine in Christianity, and has substituted in place thereof mere human notions, socialistic humanitarianism, and even the essential elements of infidelity. Its preaching is rationalistic, its worship is rationalistic, its life is rationalistic. Under the cover of this vague, and now almost unmeaning term, the attempt is made to show that Evangelical Protestantism is more a power of Belial than any thing else, and that the world would almost be better off if nothing of it had ever sprung up. All its leading schools are represented as being under the power, and devoted to the service of

rationalism—Princeton, Yale, Andover, Union College and Theological Seminary—all *but Lancaster*—all, one might be led to think from what is sometimes written, and oftener spoken—all are only minions of modern rationalism, in a more or less gross and miserable form.

*Ruin,*

it is ominously intimated, or boldly asserted, stares Evangelical Protestantism in the face. Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin, it is broadly hinted, is written upon the walls of its "*meeting-houses*," and "*doomed to decay*" upon its foundation stones, and the very pillars of its strength. It seems to be sneered at as rotten at heart, and is derided as bearing on its very brow the curse of the Lord, and as richly deserving it.

And the worst of the case is, that the only relief to this discouraging picture—the only hope left, according to these witnesses that have risen up against our Christianity in the very midst of it—what is it?

*Mercersburg Theology,*

not to designate it by a more offensive name. One, three, or six men have fallen out with almost everything bearing the name of Protestant but themselves. By a gradual process of "*subjective*" development, they have gone through various phases of thought, feeling and speculation. Starting with strong professions of ardent love for Evangelical Protestantism, and most emphatically for the fairest daughter of that Protestantism—the Reformed family, (including Presbyterians—Scotch Irish and American—Reformed Dutch and Reformed German)—they were powerfully moved by the promptings of that love to point out some "*spots in its face*," but only in its face, which ought to be removed, and to show how to remove them. Those spots, however, soon became cankers, the cankers cancers, and those cancers seated not in the face, but deeply lodged in the very vitals of the whole system. And now the portrait of Protestantism, which may be seen hung up in a most conspicuous place in the art gallery of Mercersburg theology, exhibits the nude figure of a woman, scrofulous, cancer-eaten, emaciated, ready to fall over through very weakness, and yet piping with a shrill, cracked voice the invitations of the Gospel to a dying world, and entreating

that world (of course in vain) to come to her Redeemer for health and salvation !

Having reached this point in the development of their "subjective" ideas of the church—despairing of Protestantism themselves, and trying to inspire other minds and hearts with similar sentiments—these loyal children and devoted sons of Protestantism come generously forward and offer, as the only help for all this utter misery,

*A Panacea,*

carefully prepared by themselves. Its ingredients are philosophy, theosophy, sacerdotalism, ritualism and sacramentism, and are well known. No other skill could have concocted such a medicine ; no other hands have mixed such mortar. And this most wonderful preparation, nicely combined with

*Doellingerism,*

or the elements of the old Catholic movement in Europe, is to save the world, or all must be given up for lost !

This is to be our salvation. *This* is to heal the heart supposed to be smitten well nigh to death by the discouragements of the alleged forlorn condition of Evangelical Christianity. The cause, with all its previous legacies of centuries past, with all its hallowed memories and sacred interests and trusts, must be irretrievably lost, unless, *perchance*, it may be rescued from impending ruin by the method and means devised and provided by a "corporal's guard" in Lancaster,\* and a few devoted Roman Catholics in Europe, dissatisfied with the dogma of infallibility.

This, assuredly, is

*Poor Consolation.*

We can hardly think that those who offer it have much faith in their own proposed cure. Drowning men will catch at straws. But here there are hardly straws to catch at. We confess, that had we no other hope for Christianity we should utterly despair.

---

\* Our friends in Lancaster dare not be offended if their own reproachful terms and phrases are sometimes applied to themselves. It is quite as fair, polite and proper to call them "cyphers," "cliques," and "corporal guards," as for them to call others such.



Mercersburg theology, with phases more numerous than those of the moon, is too visionary a thing to supply even a spar amidst the tossing billows, say nothing of an ark of safety. Its proposal to unite with Doellingerism does not mend the case. It only shows more clearly what was manifest before, that it has no full faith in itself. How, then, can it ask that entire Evangelical Protestantism shall abandon the vessel in which the Master is with them, though asleep while the storm rages, and trust itself to a loosely floating bit of wood, drifting hither and thither on the restless waves, at the mercy of the water and the winds.

*Where would we be,*

then, if the disheartening statements of these men were true? Evangelical Christianity powerless, Popery (that is, Papal infallibility Popery) become so tyrannical that *even Lancaster* denounces it, and nothing left but the little band of restless theological speculators at Lancaster! What a wretched plight!

But much as has been so unadvisedly done, that has been calculated to discourage the heart of the church, and heavy as are the responsibility and blame resting upon those who have done it, we have reason to rejoice in facts which prove that our cause is not only safe, but prosperous. There are, indeed, foes without and within to be met and overcome. But giants as mighty and boastful as they are have often been vanquished, and they too shall be put to flight or slain. There are evils, imperfections, faults to be corrected and removed. Such faults and evils are incidental to the best form of Christianity in this world, as they are to the life of individual Christians. And there is, through grace, vigor enough in the heavenly constitution of Evangelical Protestantism to remedy such faults.

If only we hold fast to our principles, and persevere with self-denying zeal in our work, regardless of the mockery of any deriding Sanballat, or of the machinations of more insidious foes, we may confidently commit the issue of present trials to the Lord. Then may we feel assured that, long after Popery, Puseyism and infidelity shall have become only as the memories of by-gone troubles, Evangelical Christianity, purified and strengthened by its conflicts and tribulations, will continue more faithfully than ever to proclaim the old Gospel of salvation by faith in an atoning Redeemer to a dying world.

A FLAT CONTRADICTION.

IN the "new department" opened recently in the *Messenger*, under the head of "Theology and Criticism," many things are appearing which may well cause every member of the church to pause and ponder. They shall receive proper notice in these pages from time to time.

Just now but one shall be marked. It occurs in an article, or whatever it may be called, on "The doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism on the atoning death of Christ."

Those who know the Lancaster or Mercersburg doctrine of the *incarnation*, will at once understand the purpose and drift of the entire article. But leaving out of view the general bearing of it, and what it involves and leads to, it will suffice for the present to direct attention to the following assertion, quoted literally from the article :

"When the Catechism emphasizes the exclusive efficacy of Christ's death, the implied opposition does not pertain to any other cardinal fact in His history. His death is not opposed to His birth on the one side, or His resurrection on the other. *It does not mean to inculcate the idea that the only ground of salvation is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, not His conception and birth,*" &c., &c.

That part of the above quotation which arrests and demands special consideration, has been *italicized* by us. Let the reader look at it again, and once more.

Now, then, let him read the following quotation from the *Palatinate Liturgy of 1563*, and compare it thoughtfully with the bold and explicit declaration of the Lancaster theologians.

In the Palatinate formula for the Lord's Supper, it is said :

"From this institution of the Holy Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, we see that *He directs our faith and trust to His perfect sacrifice (once offered on the cross)*, AS TO THE ONLY GROUND AND FOUNDATION OF OUR SALVATION,\* *wherein* He is become to our hungry and thirsty souls the true meat and drink of life eternal."

Here, of course, is a flat, palpable contradiction.

Dr. Nevin, or Apple, or whoever it may be, that wrote the article referred to, declares that our church, speaking through the

---

\* The German is : " Als auf den einigen Grund und Fundament unserer Seligkeit."

Catechism, *does not mean to teach that the only ground of our salvation is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross.*

The church, speaking through her old liturgy (or rather Agenda; that is, Directory of Worship), which was published in the same year (1563) with the Catechism, under the same supervision, and by the same official authority, explicitly *declares that she did mean to teach that very thing.*

It would be very easy to prove this from the Catechism itself, and to show that Dr. Apple, or Nevin, or whoever it may be, is openly "*inculcating*" a view which is directly contrary to the plain doctrine of the Catechism. But, then, they would turn upon us and say, that *we* are not to expound the Catechism for them; or they might say, we are *seven to one* against you, and try to raise a laugh by repeating the joke about the lone juryman, and so forth.

But what about that juryman now? The case stands out in bold relief. It is Lancaster-Mercersburg theology against the doctrine of the Reformed church. It is three, four or five men at Lancaster, "set for the defense of the Gospel," against the Reformed Fathers and church of the 16th century, and against the entire church since, excepting only the little clique of theologians in Mercersburg or Lancaster, who seem to be beside themselves with the thought that they are going to revolutionize Protestantism.

This flat, unblushing contradiction, is rich in significant lessons, inferences and suggestions. Note a few of them:

1. Those Lancaster theologians and critics are evidently bent on pushing their doctrinal and other innovations right through, no matter what may be crushed under the wheels of their theological Juggernaut, or be cut in pieces by the edge of their theological swords. They think that the Heidelberg Catechism *should* teach their doctrines, and so they *make* it teach them, by boldly asserting that it does. What if the plain letter of the book is against *their* notions? what if the explicit, repeated declarations of Ursinus, who mainly wrote the book, are against their notions? what if the church, solemnly avowing its faith at the holy table of the Lord, is against them? What is all this to them? They want the Catechism to teach *their* "*idea*," and it must be made to do it. They boldly declare, *that it does teach their idea.* Who will dare to deny it? If any should, and sup-



port his denial by no matter what plain proofs, only let him be defamed as a troubler in the church, and denounced as guilty of slander and falsehood. Smite him on the mouth. Cut off the hand, the impudent hand that dare write a sentence exposing the opposition of Lancaster theologians to the historical faith of the Reformed church. Fabricate a charge against him by which he may be ejected from the Synod, and stigmatized before the church. Will not that prove his exposure of the contradiction, villifying and false?

2. What wretchedly unreliable expounders of our Reformed faith, and its Catechism, must men be who could blunder into so gross a contradiction as that exposed in this case. They ought to be familiar with all the standard works in which the doctrines of the church are set forth. And yet here they have been led by their blind zeal for certain notions of theirs, to use unwittingly the very words in which the church testifies and declares what it holds, to assert that it *does not hold that*. Surely, the fowler has been caught in his own snare.

3. How little are the statements and declarations of such men, as to what the Reformed church holds on any essential point, worth. Here is a cardinal doctrine, plainly taught, solemnly "*emphasized*" by the church, so as to leave no room in candid, intelligent minds for misapprehension. But these men stand forth and deliberately, in print, affirm that the church means directly the opposite of what she says she means. Shall such teachers be our leaders in matters of faith and doctrine? Do they not, by such flagrant contradictions, shake all confidence in their ability to represent and expound the faith of the Reformed church?

4. Finally, if cardinal doctrines like that of the atonement by the vicarious sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ, are thus dealt with by the persons who write such articles as that under notice, what may not be expected of them with regard to other doctrines? It seems as though they regarded our church standards of faith as mere toys for them to play with, or tools with which to cut and hew a path through the forest for their own car.

Where is all this to end?

---

DURING the last ten years, 385,000 copies of the Scriptures have been circulated in Turkey, for which £18,000 have been paid.

## THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

*Of Holy Days, Fasts, and Choice of Meats.*

ALTHOUGH religion is not tied to time, yet it cannot be planted and exercised without a right division of time and order. Every church selects a certain time for its public prayers, for proclamation of the Gospel, and for the administration of the Sacraments; but it is not lawful for each individual to overthrow this order of the church at his own pleasure. For if no legal day of rest were appointed for the outward exercise of religion, it is certain that men would be drawn away from it by their own affairs.

Hence, in the primitive church, we see not only certain hours in the week appointed for meetings, but also the day of the Lord consecrated to holy rest from the age of the Apostles; which is now yet rightly observed by our churches for the worship of God and charity. Yet, herein we do not wish to give place to the Jewish custom or to superstition. For we do not believe that one day is more holy than another, nor that *rest* in and for itself is pleasing to God. But we also celebrate the day of the Lord, not the Sabbath, out of free reverence.

Moreover, we highly commend it, if the congregation, according to Christian liberty, keep piously the days in memory of the birth (Christmas), the circumcision, the passion, the resurrection, the ascension, and the sending of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples. But as for festival days in honor of men, or saints, we condemn them. For certainly festival days belong to the first table of the Lord, and are due to God alone. And, in addition, the saints feasts which have been done away with by us, have much that is corrupt, useless, and unprofitable. But we also confess that the remembrance of saints may, in due time and place, be commended to the people in sermons profitably, and that the holy examples of holy men may be held up before all for their imitation.

But the stronger that the church of Christ makes complaint in respect to excess, drunkenness, and all sorts of intemperance, the more earnestly it commends unto us Christian fasting. For this fasting is nothing else than the temperance and abstinence of the pious; yea, a discipline in the watching and chastising of our

flesh, undertaken for the present necessity, whereby we humble ourselves before God and withdraw from the flesh those things which nourish it to the end, that it may the more willingly and easily obey the spirit. Hence, those do not fast at all who do not direct it in this way, but believe they have fasted if they stuff themselves once a day, and at certain and prescribed times refrain from certain food, thinking that by this work they please God and do a good work. Fasting is an assistance to prayer, and to all virtuous exercises of the pious. We can read in the prophets that God had no pleasure in the fasts where the Jews refrained themselves from food, but not from vices. Isa. 58: 4, 5; Jer. 14: 42; Zech. 7: 5, 6.

But there is also a public or special fasting. In old time they appointed public fasts in troublous times, or in afflictions of the church; where they abstained from all food until evening. This whole time was devoted to pious prayers, worship and repentance. It was an almost public mourning, and the prophets often make mention of the same, especially Joel 2: 12. Such fasts must also be appointed in our days in times of heavy afflictions in the church. Private fasting is employed by individuals among us accordingly as each one feels the spirit weakened in him, and he then withdraws that which might nourish the flesh. All fasting must flow out of a free, willing, and truly humble spirit, and not for the sake of applause or merit before men, yet still less that man thereby become righteous before God. Let every one fast to this end, that he may withdraw from the flesh that which nourisheth it, and so the more zealously serve God. Matt. 6: 16-18.

The fast of forty days (also called Lent), has testimony out of antiquity, but none at all from the writings of the Apostles. Hence, it ought not and cannot be imposed upon believers. Without dispute, in earlier times, there were divers manners and customs of this fast; whence Irenæus, a very ancient writer, says: "Some think that this fast should be observed one day only, others two, others many, and some forty days. This variety of keeping it did not commence first in our days, but much earlier, and originated, as I think, from those who did not simply hold fast to the old tradition, and so fell into another mode, either through negligence or ignorance." Besides, Socrates, in his history says: "Because nothing is delivered in regard to this matter from ancient times, I believe that the Apostles left this to



every man's own judgment, that every one might do what is good without fear or constraint."

Now, as concerning the choice of meats, we hold that in case of fasting, all is to be withdrawn from the flesh, whereby it is made more lusty, whereby it is immoderately refreshed, and pampered, whether it be fish, flesh, spices, delicacies or strong wine. Otherwise we know that all the creatures of God were made for the use and service of man. All that God has made is good, and not to be rejected, and to be used in the fear of God, and with true moderation. For the Apostle says (Lit. 1: 15), "To the pure all things are pure." Again (1 Cor. 10: 20), "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, eat ye, and ask no questions for conscience sake." The same Apostle calls the doctrine of those who forbid meats, "the doctrine of devils," (1 Tim. 4: 1; 3: 4). For God created the meats good, and nothing is to be rejected when received with thanksgiving, &c. And the same Apostle, in his letter to the Colossians, reproves those who by excessive abstinence wish to obtain an appearance of spirituality. Hence we condemn, in general, the Tatians, and Encratites, and all the disciples of Enstatius, against whom the Synod at Gangres was held (Col. 2: 18, 23).

#### CHAPTER XXV.

##### *Of Instructing the Youth and Visiting the Sick.*

The Lord enjoined upon His people, in the old covenant, that they should, with the greatest care, and *early*, instruct the youth well; yea, He commanded expressly that they should teach them His law, and explain to them the mysteries of the Sacraments. And since it is evident from the Gospels and the letters of the Apostles that the Lord has no less reference to the young of His people in the new covenant, since He openly testifies and says (Matt. 19: 14), "Suffer the little children to come unto Me, . . . for of such is the kingdom of heaven;" therefore, the pastors of the church do wisely when they early and carefully instruct the young, laying the first foundations of faith, faithfully teaching the first chief parts of our religion, by expounding the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the mode of the Sacraments, and other rudiments of our religion. Let the congregation here also manifest its faith and zeal in bringing the children to be catechised, as being desirous and glad to

have them well instructed. Deut. 4: 9, 10; 6: 7, 20; 11: 19. Ex. 12: 26; 13: 14. Matt. 10: 14.

But since men never experience greater temptations than in times of bodily weakness and sickness, where body and soul are alike tried, it certainly beseems the pastor to be watchful for the salvation of his flock—to show all care and watchfulness in such diseases and infirmities. Hence, the sick should be visited betimes; and the pastors should be quickly sent for, if circumstances require it. They are to comfort them, strengthen and guard them in the true faith, against the dangerous suggestions of Satan. Let them pray with the sick person at home, and, when necessary, pray publicly in the meeting for the recovery of the sick, and care that they may have a happy passage out of this life. But the Popish visitation of the sick, with its extreme unction, we do not approve, as above said, because it contains much that is absurd, and is not approved by the canonical sacred Scriptures.

---

#### ROME'S SPIRIT.

THE *Catholic Standard* of July 12th has two noteworthy articles, both doubtless from the pen of its editor, George Dering Wolff, recently a minister of the Reformed church, now a layman in the church of Rome, and a son of the late Dr. Bernard Wolff, a professor in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed church. The first of these articles is a jubilant trumpet blast on the reception of Rev. E. O. Forney into the Catholic church. The other is entitled "*The Slavery of Protestantism*," and is a criticism on an article in *Scribner's Monthly*. These articles have their value most as showing the animus of a young convert to Romanism. There is that apparent in the article, and more felt than seen, that will remind those who knew the editor as he was twenty years ago, of *human nature* as it was modified by the peculiarities of the man. The spirit that prevails in Romanism has given intensity to these characteristics, and has called forth and put into even others her own peculiar products. But passing all these exhibits, we direct attention to a few suggestive facts that stand out to view in these articles.

1. There is the nicely disguised, but real effort, to hold up the value of the acquisition Rome has made in Mr. Forney, etc., etc. Perhaps this is very needful. One does not like to hear an ovation over a *nothing*. It is natural, and very Romish, to magnify the importance of a renegade. It relieves their own feelings, and it some way seems to justify the kind of kidnapping that is, to more or less extent, felt to be involved in such transfers. Yet none should feel bad about it. Minds seek their level, and souls their resting-place, and they should be free; and in this case they followed the guiding of posts. If Rome needs this kind of talent, and finds use for such spirits, and is not cheated; if she is lacking in such men, and needs character and learning such as Lancaster affords, then the Reformed church would most gladly give her the entire school, and not suffer from the estrangement in the gift. But it is so small in great Babylon to make such ado over such acquisitions.

2. Then we notice how very pertly the editor sneers at "*the sect*" which he has abandoned. Some of this was taught him by "the guide-posts;" and how ungrateful it is thus to apply the insulting epithet; but most is the imbument of the Romish spirit which notoriously is designed to root natural affection out of the bosom of her servants. The editor, being an apt disciple, has progressed already to that stage when, flippantly, he speaks of his father's church as a *sect*. His father's faith, his father's honored reputation, and his father's claim to respect and affection, have all been laid aside with the divine faith from which he himself apostatized. This is one of the clearest marks of the spirit of the beast that Rome begets in her adopted children, "without natural affection."

3. We notice, too, the invitation to all members of sects to behold and see "the light and peace" that the editor has found in "the bosom of the Holy Mother"—the church of Rome. How, like a young convert of a fanatic *sect* this sounds. How much like some things our Lord found to rebuke while on earth. How very alien to the spirit and life of the church whose quiet fold he has forsaken. How much in harmony with the self-laudation and pride of Rome. Humble men, modest men, earnest men, are wont to speak of their inmost spiritual experiences, *if they ever speak of them at all*, in most subdued tones and simple words, and not with the arrogancy of a Pharisee or lightness of an actor. What



need of this *if* it were true?—would not all men see it? Is it not a bid for notoriety? Is it not a sham that covers what it is needful to hide? Is not this an unreal cry—the cry of a disappointed and unhappy soul, whose wanderings have not yet ended?

4. We notice that this convert to the absolutism of Rome talks of “the slavery of Protestantism.” He who was embarrassed by its freedom and sought refuge for it in the *Popocracy* of Rome. He who remained in a Protestant church as long as he listed, and that, too, after he was no longer a Protestant. He who left the Protestant church when he was ready, who was not broke on a wheel or burnt, this man talks of Protestant slavery. He who professes to “*submit*” himself wholly to the authority of the Romish church; who recognizes the Pope as infallible; who abrogated his senses and reason at the dictation of *the* church; who holds his salvation at the pleasure of a priest; who dare not even read in theology or science but what is permitted him; who, if he utter in his paper a thought disloyal to the Pope, would at once find his paper under ban; this man who abused the freedom of a Protestant church; this man prates of the slavery of Protestantism. The education begun at Mercersburg, that tends to darken and enslave, has well done its work. To go to Rome, requires that manhood and reason be left with the sects. We might notice more, but this will suffice. It is sad to see this end of G. D. Wolff.

ULRIC.

---

#### THE CRISIS IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

It must be evident to every one who is at all acquainted with the state of things in the Church of England, that this church has reached one of the most important crises in her whole history. When the series of tracts for the *Times* was commenced at Oxford, just forty years ago, it was evident that a concerted effort was made to destroy the Protestant character of that church. A number of her ablest men were banded together, disseminating widely through the press, many through the pulpit, and by personal methods, principles that had been discarded in the Reformation. For several years this Romanizing crusade, carried on

within the church, was the occasion of earnest controversy and of deep anxiety in regard to the result ; but at length the true character of the movement was developed by the publication, in 1841, of the famous Tract, No. 90. The mask fell off from the prime movers, several of whom, including the author of the fatal tract, sought refuge in the church of Rome, and the crisis seemed to be past. It was only deferred.

During the thirty years that have intervened between that period and the present, the same agencies have been at work, for a long time more silently, but for many years past openly, and with the most abundant evidence of the designs of the authors of the movement. Those who have been most instrumental in introducing the various forms of ritualism into the church, and preaching doctrines closely allied to those of Rome, have strenuously denied that there was any such tendency in their preaching or practice ; but they have shown what was the real tendency and the intent of their teaching, by dropping off, one after another, and sometimes in companies, from the Church of England and entering the church of Rome. Many others who love the church, and who adhere to the truth as taught in her Thirty-nine Articles, have tried to make it appear that there was no danger, and have accused those who have raised the alarm of being enemies of the church, as if it were the part of fidelity to cry peace, when there is no peace.

The controversy, if such it may be called, has been deepening of late, and no one who is in the least acquainted with the state of the church, with the principles that are held and avowed by thousands of the clergy, and with the strenuous efforts that are made to give them currency and secure their success, can doubt that there is a deliberate plan to unprotestantize the Church of England and carry it over bodily into the arms of the Pope. This purpose is often denied, and there are multitudes in England who are still singing the syren song, that there is no danger, just as there have been all along ; but it is the policy of all errorists to conceal their ultimate ends. It is perfectly clear to any one who has his eyes open, that Rome is the end of the crusade which the leaders in this movement have undertaken, and that the progress which has been already made is most alarming.

For the information of some who do not have access to foreign journals, and who are not familiar with the matter, we adduce the

testimony of one of the English bishops, of Bath and Wells. In a recent charge to the clergy of his diocese, he gave the following summary—we may well call it an imposing array—of the evidences of this Romanizing movement. He says :

“I have thought it right to speak thus plainly, because it is notorious that there are those in the church at the present day who have deliberately and avowedly undertaken the task of revolutionizing the Church of England, as to her doctrine and her ritual, and of effecting her reunion with the church of Rome. There is scarcely a single doctrine of that corrupt communion which it has not been attempted of late to bring back among us—the depreciation of the Bible as the rule of faith, and the exaltation of the church as a fountain of revelation ; the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead ; solitary masses as sacrifices by which non-communicants are benefited ; such a local presence of the Lord Jesus in the consecrated elements as to be a proper object of worship, a worship directed to the elements as containing Him ; the invocation and worship of the Virgin Mary, and prayers for her intercession ; auricular confession and priestly absolution ; penance, purgatory, and so on ; not one of which was taught or practiced in the Anti-Nicene church.

“And, together with these, have been introduced a whole host of practices of a minor kind, all savoring of Romanism, and intended to familiarize the Anglican worshiper with Roman ways. The English priests and deacons are to be dressed as like as possible to Romish priests and deacons ; the church choristers are to be as like as possible to the acolytes and choristers in a Romish church ; the Lord’s table is to be made and dressed as like as possible to the altar of a Romish church ; the chants and music are to be as like as possible to those in the church of Rome ; the processions, banners, crosses and crucifixes of Romish ceremonies are to be exactly imitated ; the Roman use of incense and wafer bread is to be adopted ; in short, in everything Anglican worship is to be assimilated as closely as possible to the worship in Belgian, Italian and other Romish churches.

“Then, again, we are introduced to a variety of supplements to the Prayer-book. Offices are provided for the consecration of portable altars, for the benediction of church bells, for the consecration of chrism and holy oil with which to anoint the sick, for



the blessing of altar-cloths, corporals, patens, pyxes, albs, chasubles, &c. We have offices, too, for the admission of novices, male and female; for the profession of brothers and sisters; for the installation of superiors of brotherhood, and mother superiors of sisterhoods; and we have a great variety of litanies for the dead as well as for the living, all as unlike the litany of the church as it is possible to conceive.

“Another method largely used for familiarizing the English churchman’s mind with Roman Catholic doctrines, is the introduction and recommendation on a large scale of Roman Catholic books of devotion, and especially books connected with confession, and with the (so-called) sacrifice of the altar. The mind is thus familiarized with the teaching of Liguori, and Ignatius Loyola, and with breviaries and missals, and alienated from the language of the Anglican Prayer-book and the doctrines of the Anglican church.

“All this, together with the tone used by certain writers, and the endeavor to hoot down those who resist the attempt to Romanize the Church of England, as if they were not true churchmen, but ignorant, uncatholic dissenters, convinces me that there is a deliberate conspiracy on foot somewhere to bring back the church to communion with, and obedience to, the Pope of Rome. Indeed, if all these doctrines and practices which I have detailed, are and ought to be the practices and doctrines of the English church, I am at a loss to know on what grounds our separation from Rome can be justified. . . . So that we are brought face to face with the question, Shall the Church of England return to her allegiance to the church of Rome?”

This is a simple, clear statement of the alarming errors in doctrine and practice that are now not only tolerated, but fostered in the Church of England; a statement made by one of her own bishops in a solemn charge to the clergy. The truth of his statement can no more be called in question than the fact that the sun shines at midday, or that darkness reigns at midnight. The only question is as to the prevalence of these Romish errors and Romanizing practices. If we were to judge from the éclat with which they have been received; from the influential names in the church and in the State which have given them currency; from the persistence and the impunity with which they have been disseminated; from the utter unwillingness shown by the vast

majority of the bishops, including the archbishops, to do anything either effectual or earnest to arrest their progress ; from the impossibility of obtaining any plain judicial decision in condemnation either of the errors or their advocates ; from the discriminating favor shown by the prelates and ministerial officers of government to those who are favorable to such views, if not their open supporters—we should say the power of the church and the State was pledged, at least, to suffer the work of converting the Church of England to the church of Rome to go on. Only last week we copied from the ablest paper in the Church of England the following significant remark : “ Five years have almost expired since Mr. Gladstone was placed at the head of affairs, and during that period he has done more to Romanize the Church of England in general, and the University of Oxford in particular, than any former Premier.”

A glance at the weakness of the opposition made to this state of things is equally alarming. There are a few such men among the laity as the Earl of Shaftesbury, who are not afraid to lift up their voices and sound the notes of warning ; but very few among the clergy who have the courage, if they have the disposition, to take a bold stand in the face of a controlling ecclesiastical sentiment, and show that they value the truth above any particular ecclesiastical standing. One of the chief sources of danger, too, lies in that which, in itself, is a cardinal virtue—the attachment of the clergy and the laity to the church. The mass of them will go with it wherever it goes. They would not break with the church to save the ark of God—the truth itself. They would be persuaded that they were doing right in taking such a course, just as they are persuaded they are doing right now, in not setting themselves resolutely to oppose the downward tendency of things. The clergy would be led astray by their attachment to the church, and by the powerful influences by which they are surrounded, and the people, as in nearly all great religious movements, would be swayed by their religious teachers.

We, on this side of the ocean, are not unconcerned spectators of this movement, which has now reached its crisis, to be decided soon one way or the other. The Church of England, since its Reformation, has been one of the bulwarks of Protestantism ; in another sense than that in which the title was given to her king, a Defender of the Faith. Her noble army of confessors and mar-

tyrs are a part of the treasure of the church universal. No one of any evangelical church in any land can look without deep concern upon the persistent, extensive, and already too successful effort to effect her return to the embrace of the anti-Christian church of Rome. Let every one in every land who loves the truth and the church, which the Lord Jesus bought with His own precious blood, cease not to pray that such a calamity to the cause of Christ may be averted, and that this great church may come forth out of the ordeal purified and sanctified, and prepared for the great work that is before the army of the Lord—the conquest of the world for Christ.—*New York Observer.*

---

#### THE NEVINITE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION BY BAPTISM.

It must be distinctly remembered, that these articles are not so much a review of what Mr. Rupp has published and advocated on the subject discussed, as of the doctrine of Mercersburg theology, or Nevinism, upon it. Mr. Rupp's first article appeared in the *Mercersburg Review* of last January. In the February following, Drs. Nevin and Gerhart gave their emphatic, public endorsement of that number of the *Review*, and commended it as an illustration of the vigor, profound learning and influence of their peculiar theory or system. This invests not only Mr. Rupp's particular article, but all others in the same number of the *Review*, with special authority. Dr. Nevin is willing to have it taken as an excellent specimen of his theology, and as a true exhibition of his scheme.

Our readers will please remember this all through. It is not Mr. Rupp's errors we are exposing or refuting, but those of Nevinism and that school.

Let them also keep clearly before them the doctrine of the school on the subject in hand. As has been shown by literal quotations, that doctrine is this: *Regeneration is a conveyance, by emanation, of a portion of the substance of God into the centre of man's soul; that the channel through which that substance is conveyed is baptism; and that the substance so conveyed is the actual,*



*The Nevinite Doctrine of Regeneration, &c.* 513

*literal, substantial germ and life-basis of the new life in the regenerate.*

This doctrine, as a whole, and in each of its points, is declared to be the doctrine of the Scriptures and of the Reformed church. Proofs of this assertion were boldly promised, and a *seeming* attempt was made to give such proofs.

On examining the pretended proofs, however, we found, as our readers will remember, that Mr. R. somehow *forgot the very first point* in his doctrine—that about regeneration consisting in a conveyance of the substance of God to the soul—and went right off to an essentially different point. Neither in his alleged Scriptural argument or proofs, nor in those he quotes from Reformed sources, can one word be found in support of the first point in his doctrine. Indeed, as said, he *appears* to give that up, as to any actual attempt to prove it. He does it quietly, but still he does it. Until, however, he gives up the point openly, and confesses that he and his school have erred regarding it, and taught a false, unscriptural and anti-Reformed doctrine, we have a right to hold the school to the doctrine, and shall do so.

But for good reasons, given by us in our previous articles, we consented to follow Mr. R. into the new position he took, as a representative of his school. In doing so, his alleged *Scripture proofs* were examined, and found *not* to teach the Nevinite doctrine of baptismal regeneration in any true sense, *but* to teach a doctrine which necessarily excluded the theory of the N. school.

Next we turned to alleged proofs from Reformed standards. Under this point it was shown in our last (September) article, that *the Reformed doctrine of regeneration* (as included in the *objective* part of true *conversion*) is equally opposed, negatively and positively, to the Nevinite view.

Nevinism teaches, that regeneration is a change *of* the substance of the soul, by the insertion of a new substance, a part of the substance of God into it.

Reformed theology teaches, that in regeneration the substance of the soul has nothing taken from it, as such, or added to it, but that its quality or nature is changed, reviewed, raised to newness of life. This was shown by sufficient quotations from standard Reformed writings.

Only two points remain, therefore, for us to notice: (1) That BAPTISMAL regeneration, as taught by Nevinism, is in direct con-

tradition with Reformed doctrine on the subject; and (2) that the quotations made by Mr. Rupp do not support his theory, but are erroneously interpreted and applied by him and his school.

1. Reformed standards and authorities do not teach that regeneration is tied to baptism, or that baptism (that is, of course, the formal sacrament of water-baptism) is the means of effecting it; but they teach a doctrine of the Sacrament of baptism which is opposed to any such view, and excludes it.

This is proven, *first*, by the doctrine of the Reformed church concerning the Sacraments, as it applies to baptism.

In a general way (generically) our standards declare the purpose and office of the Sacrament to be *CONFIRMATORY of salvation previously granted*. Thus the Heidelberg Catechism says (Quest. 65), "we are made partakers of Christ and all His benefits, by faith only," and that "the Holy Ghost works this faith in the heart by the *preaching of the Gospel*, and (then) *confirms* it by the use of the Sacraments." And again, in Q. 66, it is said "the Sacraments are holy visible signs and seals, appointed of God *for this end*, that by the use thereof He may the more fully *declare and seal to us the promise* of the Gospel, viz: *that He grants us freely the remission of sin, and life eternal*, for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross."

No language could make the matter plainer than this. Here the whole idea, purpose and use of the Sacraments, as Sacraments, are clearly set forth. The purpose and use of the Sacraments, *in distinction from the Gospel*, is particularly noted. The two are viewed separately, however closely related they may be to each other. By the Gospel the Holy Ghost works salvation in the soul, saves men, and does all that needs to be done (*objectively*, as Nevinites delight to say) by God in the saving application of redemption, through Jesus Christ, to man. Man's redemption, including regeneration, is (objectively) accomplished by the Holy Ghost in the use of the Gospel (distinguished now from the Sacraments), as the means or instrument. Not that regeneration consists only in a mental conviction, or hearty repentance, wrought by the truth revealed through the Gospel, but that it is effected by the immediate power of the Holy Ghost, brought to bear effectually upon "the inmost centre of man's spiritual life," in connection, ordinarily, with the Gospel.

*Then* when this has been effected (or even, it may be, whilst

it is being effected), the *Sacraments* come in, by God's gracious appointment, not to supply Him with a medium or channel for the conveyance of grace in the form of a substance, or for the purpose of effecting (objectively) regeneration, *but for the (subjective) purpose of enlarging and strengthening man's power, or capacity, personally to receive and appropriate the salvation of the Lord.*

Hence our Catechism so expressly says and reiterates, that the Sacraments are mainly *exhibitory, declarative and sealing ordinances.*

And what do they exhibit, declare and seal? That men are regenerated by them? or that either of them is a channel, a medium for the transmission of a substantial, seminal germ of a portion of the substance of the theanthropic nature of Christ? Far from it; nothing like it.

What they exhibit and declare ("*besser zu verstehen geben*"), as it is in German (see Niemeyer), is "*the promise of the Gospel.*" What promise? That men will be regenerated by them, as Nevinism teaches? By no means. But "*that He (God) grants us freely the remission of sin, and life eternal, for the sake of that one sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the cross.*"

And as though, after all this explicitness, the doctrine of the church might still not be rightly understood, or be misunderstood, or perverted by some Romanizing minds, we have the doctrine reiterated, with a most important additional declaration, in the next (67th) Question. The additional declaration is, that both the *Word* (that is, *the Gospel*, as Lancaster will please especially note) and *Sacraments* "*are appointed for this end, that they may direct our faith to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross, as the only ground of our salvation;\** for the Holy Ghost teaches us in the Gospel, and *assures* us by the Sacraments, that the *whole* of our salvation depends upon that one sacrifice of Christ, which He offered for us on the cross."

In the face now of such declarations as these—so clear, so explicit—our young friend Mr. Rupp, misled by the errors and influence of his teachers, could advance and defend the doctrine

---

\* We have shown in another article, "A Flat Contradiction," how incautiously and wildly the Lancaster teachers will run directly against most explicit assertions of the Catechism, like this concerning the "only ground of our salvation." See the article.



of his remarkable article in the *Review*! And two of those teachers could endorse and applaud his attempt!

Why, the definitions and declarations of the Catechism go so directly against the Nevinite theory of regeneration by baptism, that they seem to have anticipated the attempt to foist such a theory into the church, and to have taken special pains to guard against it, as well as against other kindred Romish errors which our Reformed fathers knew of, and took pains, impliedly at least, to refute.

To show that Ursinus, the principal author of the Catechism, meant exactly what the plain words of the Catechism teaches, regarding the Sacraments in general, is not only superfluous, but would require more space than we can spare. Two brief quotations from his Commentaries, must "therefore" suffice:

"The Sacraments are means through which the Holy Ghost confirms faith already called into exercise, and for this reason ought to follow the Word."

"The Sacraments are dispensed only to those who are members of the church, who profess repentance and faith, and are designed to preserve and strengthen their faith." (See Ursinus' Comm., Williard's edition, p. 352, and read with special care, Section 8, on p. 349).

Such, then, is the Reformed doctrine of the Sacraments in general, or as a whole. Now, no part of a thing can be greater than the whole, or include in it what is not contained whole. No species can be broader than the genus. Neither baptism, nor the Lord's Supper, therefore, can involve more in the way of virtue, efficacy, or design, than belongs to Sacraments as such. Each comes under the general nature and definitions of a Sacrament, and must be bounded or limited by that nature and those definitions.

Admitting these premises, which are too obvious to need demonstration, the conclusion must certainly follow. The doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism, concerning the Sacraments, utterly excludes the idea of regeneration by baptism, and consequently excludes the Nevinite notion of such regeneration.

In the *second* place, we find the doctrine of *baptism*, specifically considered, as set forth in Reformed standards, equally opposed to the Nevinite doctrine. This might, of course, be expected from what has just been shown regarding the Sacraments in

general. But proofs will be demanded, and we are ready to give them.

We begin with our Catechism, and here with Question 69. Mark the significance of the question itself:

"How art thou *admonished* and *assured* by holy baptism *that the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is of real advantage to thee?*"

According to this question, already, the use and purpose of baptism is—what? To effect what Nevinism, as speaking by Mr. Rupp, affirms? No; but to *admonish* and *assure* us of something. Of what? That in order to be saved, some substance of the God-head must, by emanation, be conveyed to us; or that any foreign new substance of any kind must be introduced into the centre of our souls, and this through baptism as a medium or channel? Not a word of it. Nothing like this is most distantly intimated. It is excluded by the very conception: "*thou art admonished and assured.*" Of what, then, are we so assured and admonished? Why, that "*the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is of real advantage to us.*"

How is this done by Baptism? Answer: "*Thus, that Christ appointed this EXTERNAL WASHING WITH WATER, adding thereto this promise, that I AM as certainly washed by His blood and Spirit from all the pollution of my soul—that is, from all my sins—as I am washed externally with water, by which the filthiness of the body is commonly washed away.*"

Here now note the following points: 1. Baptism is designated an "external washing with water."

2. It is expressly distinguished from being "washed by His blood and Spirit."

3. It is designed for those *who are or have been* washed by His blood and Spirit."

4. It is applied to such for the purpose of assuring them more fully in their own hearts that they have been "cleansed from all the pollution of their souls; that is from all their sins, as certainly as they are now washed externally with water."

To this we might add, 5. That the answer impliedly, at least, teaches that regeneration consists not in any addition to the substance of the soul, or in any change of the essential nature of the soul, but in purifying it, in cleansing it of sin, and so renewing it. But this point need not be pressed; and not to give our

friends in L. an opportunity of turning attention from their gross error by sophistical quibbling, we shall lay no stress upon this point.

How far removed from all this, and how irreconcilably contrary to it, is the Nevinite doctrine of Baptism, and regeneration by Baptism! According to Mercersburg theology, the question would have to read somewhat like this:

How art thou admonished and assured by holy Baptism that by it God doth regenerate thee; that is, convey to thee a portion of His own essential substance, to become in thee a germ of a new theanthropic life, &c., &c.? And the answer would have to be in idea and terms corresponding to such a question.

This mere statement of the case carries all the force of an ample refutation of the pretence that the two views agree, and shows the absurdity of claiming any agreement between them.

And this becomes still more manifest in the next (70th) Question and answer of the Catechism. Here we are told explicitly "what it is to be washed by the blood and Spirit of Christ," in distinction from external water Baptism. And the answer shows how widely the two differ in their design and effect. The difference thus stated indicates, in one respect, the difference between the doctrine of our church, and that of Nevinism on this subject; that is, the difference between grace wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost, and that which is alleged to be wrought by Sacramentistic ritualism.

But the Catechism does not stop here. The doctrine of the Sacraments, and of Baptism as one of them, had been so much abused and perverted (as, alas, it continues to be,) that there was special need of guarding it at all points, negatively and positively, against such perversion and abuse.

There were those (as there still are) who claimed for Baptism as a Sacrament more than was warranted by the Bible, and what led to a superstitious view of the Sacrament. They insisted that the "external Baptism," that is water Baptism as a Sacrament, was itself the washing away of sin. In other words, they taught a part of the error of Nevinism on this subject.

This error is met by the next two Questions of the Catechism (72 and 73.) It is repudiated and refuted negatively (72), and positively (73) by an explanation of the true import of such phrases as "the washing of regeneration," and "washing away of sins,"



when used in connection with baptism. These are the two phrases, or expressions used in the Bible in connection with baptism, to which those holding the error of regeneration by baptism are ever appealing as proof of their views. Especially was this done by Papists in the Reformation period (as since.) Hence, the Catechism notices them, and gives their true sense. But, in doing this, it plainly denies the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

Further to show that such is the position of the Catechism on this subject, we refer to the *reasons given in 274, for the baptism of infants*. Mark those reasons. Because—

1. They *are included* in the covenant and church (Gemeinde, ekklesia, people) of God.
2. Redemption from sin *by the blood of Christ and the Holy Ghost the author of faith* is promised to them. Therefore, *by baptism as a sign of the covenant*.
3. They must be admitted (incorporated) into the Christian church (the *visible* church, that formally and outwardly organized.)
4. And so be distinguished from the children of unbelievers, *as was done under the Old Testament by circumcision*.

Is not this plainly enough opposed to everything like baptismal regeneration, in the Nevinite, or in any sense? Here is a place where the doctrine might have been very naturally and impressively introduced, had such a view been held or believed to be Scriptural. That it is excluded, furnishes incontestable evidence that it was not held, and not believed to be Scriptural.

Throughout, therefore, the Catechism sets forth and explains baptism in a way wholly agreeing with its previous definition of Sacraments, and with which Nevinism on this point is utterly irreconcilable.

Now this view of what the Catechism teaches, is not merely confirmed by Ursinus; we have taken it from his Commentary. It is his explanation of the matter, as summed up in a few words. But our Nevinite friends may demand the very words of Ursinus himself. Then, let them have his words.

After stating the definition of baptism given in the Catechism, he says (Commentary, page 357): "It may also be thus defined: Baptism is a sacred rite instituted by Christ in the New Testament, *by which we are washed with water* in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *TO SIGNIFY that God receives us into His favor* on account of the blood which his Son shed for

us, and *that we are regenerated* by his Spirit ; and that we, on the other hand, bind ourselves to exercise faith in God, and to perform new obedience to Him." " Or, more briefly, it is a washing with water appointed by the Son of God \* \* *to declare that he who is thus washed \* \* is reconciled to God by faith and is sanctified* by the Holy Spirit into eternal life."

" He that is baptized *may know that he enjoys* the benefits *signified* by this Sacrament, which consist in justification and regeneration, if he believe!" (364.) " It is necessary that the Spirit should first renew us, of *which renewal baptism is the sign.*"

" God assures us by baptism of our reception into the church."

" *Baptism merely requires regeneration, and is applied unto all those whom the church regards as regenerated.*" (380.)

If these quotations do not satisfy our Lancaster advocates of regeneration by baptism, that Ursinus is against them, we commend to them the extracts from his writings, as well as those of Olevianus found in *Sudhoff's* Leben, &c. We can give only a sample of the declarations on the subject abounding in the work :

" For this is certain and sure, that God instituted his Sacraments and covenant signs only for those whom the church is to acknowledge and hold to be members of the covenant, and *not first to make them Christians by the Sacraments, but who are already such.*" (Page 633.)

Ursinus was led to make this strong and decided declaration, because Popery taught the contrary.

Was Ursinus a rationalist, or is Nevinism Popery ?

Any amount of testimony corroborating the above view of the faith of the Reformed church, could be supplied from earlier and later Reformed standards. But any quotations we might make would be simply repeating what Ursinus has said, and said with sufficient clearness, and what has often been quoted in the MONTHLY on the subject. If our readers and Mr. Rupp will turn to the *May* number of the present year, they will find (pp. 223-227) full extracts from a sermon by Dr. *Wilsing*, of Stargard, most explicitly confirming our statements.

This point, then, may be fairly considered established. The Nevinite theory of regeneration by baptism, is as contrary to the doctrine of the Reformed church as it was shown to be unsupported by, and contrary to, the Scriptures.

Only one thing remains, therefore, to be done, viz: To show

that the passages quoted by Mr. Rupp (as well as by others) from the Reformed writings, in support of the Nevinite theory, are by them misinterpreted, or misapplied, or both.

This shall be done in our next number, the Lord willing.

We may be allowed only to add now, that as Mr. Rupp impliedly promised to renounce his theory if it was proven to be not truly *Reformed*, we hope he will not recede from his promise, but be as good as his word. And why should we not also hope, that *all* who have been decoyed from the truth of our Reformed faith by the speciousness of philosophic errors, may be brought to see their mistake, and joyfully return again to the sure Apostolic ground of Evangelical Reformed Christianity. We desire to be in hearty theological, as well as formal ecclesiastical, fellowship with them. But we cannot go with them, even in theory, to Rome.

---

#### WHAT THEY MEAN BY DEVELOPMENT.

FOR many years past the originators and leaders of Mercersburg neology, have been toying with the term *development*. Under cover of this broad, convenient word, they have put forth from time to time, each and all of their peculiar conceits and tenets. No matter how much like a *stone* the thing they offered might be, they would contend that it was only a legitimate development of *bread*. Strongly as it might resemble a *scorpion*, they protested that it was only a better developed *egg*. And even though it would drag its abhorrent length along so like a reptile, that almost every one who saw it, declared it to be a *serpent*, they would indignantly repel the assertion, denounce it a slanderous reflection on themselves, and most solemnly insist that it was but "a new and improved development of the genuine *ichthus*, that is, the fourth century *fish*, or *dolphin* !

In this way they deceived many who, long ago, (long before October 22d, 1863! *as they themselves well know*, though like true kindred of the Jesuits, they can justify themselves in asserting or insinuating the contrary) discovered the deception and exposed it. For doing which "unkind" thing to them, however much the exposure was owed to the church, those



making it have been most violently and maliciously defamed, and relentlessly pursued with what some men would consider shameful assaults upon their private character as well as official standing.

In this way many brethren, who at heart are truly and honestly Reformed in their faith, are letting themselves be now still deceived (*verplaudert*, the Germans say), by very plausible assurances that those things in the Lancaster-Mercersburg theology, which have a suspiciously novel look, and an offensively foreign (exotic) sound, are really nothing but genuine developments of old-stock doctrines of the Reformed church. At times, those trusting friends may be somewhat shocked and staggered by words, expressions, and declarations which seem, on the one hand, to be strongly contrary to our Reformed way of setting forth and expressing the matter, and on the other hand very much like the way ultra-Lutherans and Papists write and speak of it. And those confiding friends may be seen looking at each other with evident anxiety upon their faces, or somewhat ominously shaking their heads. But to quiet any rising alarm, they have been told that they did not properly understand what was said or written. They have been assured that the article, or phraseology, was only a more philosophically profound way of presenting the doctrine. Lancaster-Mercersburg theology, they have been asked to remember, is a live theology, one that makes earnest with the great life-problems of the day, and so must be allowed to choose for its deep thoughts a corresponding dress of phrases and of words. Above all, have the sympathies for those good friends been worked upon, and they have been entreated to have more confidence in the learning, integrity, and loyalty to the church, of the authors and teachers of the theology aforesaid, than to suspect them of holding or teaching any doctrine really subversive of the faith of the church. Why should those friends allow such unkind suspicions to be excited by the "hue and cry" of a little "clique" or "faction" of agitators, of disturbers of the peace of the church, of men instigated only by "disappointed ambition;" above all, of men of no learning or philosophy? "If Dr. ——— does not know, who shall?" said one, with a most innocently triumphant air.

Only last December, in front of the church where the General Synod held its sessions, one of the leading teachers of the "new ideas," said to us, with an air of injured innocence, "You most

wrongfully charge us with views contrary to the faith of the Reformed church. The charge is unkind and unjust. We are as honestly Reformed as you claim to be yourself, and are only laboring more fully to develop, and strongly to fortify, the true historical faith of the church"—or words to that effect. Only he claimed the right of development; the faith and life of the church were not to be considered as mechanically stereotyped—were not to stand still.

How many good brethren have been deluded by such appeals and claims.

Nay, it is even possible that the authors and advocates of these new notions, (new for our church), have come to deceive themselves by their own words and efforts, and now actually think that their attempted revolution of our theology and faith is only an earnest struggle for life-development; the imprisoned chrysalis of our beloved Reformed faith bursting from its cocoon; the locust buried for seventeen years in the earth, coming out of darkness into light, and triumphantly ridding itself of its shell.

This has hitherto, for the most part, seemed or claimed to be, all that our Lancaster-Mercersburg theologians meant by development. It was the development of the maiden into a bride, or of a bride into a wife. The process called for a new gown, of course, for proper bridal array. But the person was still the same. The inner identity had not been, and was not meant to be at all destroyed.

So matters have been standing, or rather moving, for some time. One of these developments after another, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, one phase of the general development after another, has appeared. A bold step has been taken, and then when the effect seemed alarming, the foot has been drawn back again. An article would appear in some "authorized publication," which struck an exceedingly high key, so high that many exclaimed, "That is going too far;" then the tone would be lowered for awhile, to allow time to breathe.

Apostacies followed, four, five, six, in quick succession. They ran in the very direction to which it was declared, by some of us, the new theology must legitimately lead, and for foretelling which we were ridiculed and denounced, as trying to raise a mad-dog cry (among others, by the Editor of that very "*church-paper*," which is itself now uttering some things which must be

rather unpalatable to our Lancaster innovations.) Those apostasies were as plainly the offspring of Mercersburg theology as sin from lust. Those beguiled into them have openly declared this, as Adam did that Eve had tempted him to fall—only that in this case the fallen imagine that they have gone down upwards.

But where are we now? What has this deceitful development farce to say for itself in September, 1873?

The other day an esteemed brother, writing to us, asked: "Did you see that article under 'Theology and Criticism,' which assails our precious doctrine of the atonement? I cannot express the pain and indignation I felt when I read it," &c.

Did we see it? Certainly we saw it. In substance we had seen the same thing years ago. It has been directly or impliedly reiterated over and over again. In its bearing and offensiveness it does not essentially differ from a sermon preached, or at least published as having been preached, at the Synod of Danville in 1869. The antagonism of the article to what our Catechism and church has ever proclaimed as the fundamental principle of our faith, is not more palpable or strong than that of the doctrine on which Nevinism avowedly bases its whole theory. *A denial of the atonement in the old Reformed apostolic sense, is a necessary sequence of that theory. And now, it is an admitted sequence.*

This, then, is what they mean by development. It is developing the faith of the Reformed church out of its proper house and home. There is the best authority for saying so. For we have been publicly told, officially notified, that the article in question, with others in the same batch, appeared "*under the control of the Faculty of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa.*"

Lancaster theology, therefore, has at last developed into the unblushing assertion, boldly, audaciously made, that "when the Catechism says that our whole salvation stands in the one sacrifice of Christ, it does not teach that this sacrifice is the principle of redemption."

That is, the Catechism does not say, what it most explicitly affirms and reaffirms. It does not mean what Ursinus and Olevianus, who prepared it, declare it means, and what thousands of Reformed theologians and expounders of the Catechism unite in testifying that it means!

Why? Because the Faculty of the Theological Seminary (of the Eastern Synod of the Reformed church) at Lancaster say so.



They "*cannot believe*" that it means what it says. In their wiser judgment "the notion is incompatible with the central position of the creed, &c."—that is, with that creed as *they* hold it.

And what then? Why *that* notion of the atonement must be cast overboard. The Lancaster Faculty will not have it in their ship!

Here, therefore, may be seen what Lancaster-Mercersburg theology means by development.

Shall the process of throwing out the ballast go on? What cardinal doctrine shall go next?

Or shall something else go, and the precious old faith be retained? It is for the church to say. But the church must say it soon, or the vessel, lightened of its best freight, will upset and sink, the wretched victim of a development driving her to sure destruction.

---

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

[THE following notice of the recent annual meeting of the *National Educational Convention*, and extracts from the paper read by the Rev. Dr. McCosh, of Princeton College, cannot fail to interest deeply those of our readers who are in proper sympathy with the cause represented by the association. The notice and extracts are copied from the Yale "*College Courant*," a weekly journal devoted to the interests of Colleges, Universities, and the higher education, and ably edited by Professor *Henry N. Day*.]

### NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of the Association was held at Elmira on the 5th, 6th, and 7th of August. The arrangements for the meeting were satisfactory, and the attendance was large.

The members were courteously received by Mayor Caldwell, to

whose welcoming address the President of the Association, Rev. B. G. Northrop, briefly but cordially responded.

After the appointment of the usual standing committee, the President introduced for the consideration of the Association, the question of the Chinese and Japanese Indemnity Funds. The unanimous voice of the gentlemen who spoke, and, evidently, of the entire Association, was in favor of restoring the funds to the respective governments, except enough retained to cover actual expenses or losses.

#### *Upper Schools.*

In the evening Prof. McCosh delivered, before a large audience an address on Upper Schools. We can give only the following extracts, being obliged for want of room to omit the historical and statistical matter :

Upper Schools is my subject. Yet I have a few words to utter as to elementary schools, but a few words as to colleges, between which the two upper schools lie.      \*      \*      \*

#### *Colleges.*

I am prepared to testify from a pretty large acquaintance with colleges on both sides of the Atlantic, that to the great body of students the American colleges impart as high and certainly as useful an education as any European colleges, as Oxford or Cambridge in England, as Edinburgh or the Scotch colleges, as Dublin and the Queen's colleges in Ireland, as Berlin and the great German universities, in all of which there are fully as many idle boys, and full as many graduating with a miserably imperfect knowledge as in the American colleges. But it is quite as true, that in some of the higher colleges of Europe they produce a select few; at the the most, one-tenth of the whole, who have attained a ripe scholarship, or reached a higher culture, or who leave college with a more fixed determination to do original work. The grand question for American colleges to consider at present is, how may we keep all the excellencies we have, and add to them the special culture of the highest European universities ?

So far as I have noticed, the answer of the most enlightened educationists in the country is : Elevate the standard of examination at entrance, raise the average age of entrants, and thus, it is said, you will secure a higher scholarship. But the question

arises, "Are we not in this way running the risk of losing some of the advantages of the American colleges, which have sent forth a greater number of well-educated young men at a comparatively early age into the professions and useful walks of life than any other country except Scotland?" I do believe that in most of our colleges there should be a higher standard for the entrance examination. I believe farther, and as far more important, that colleges should be made by public opinion brought to bear upon them, to carry out their own standard. Surely, there is pretension, in fact iniquity, involved in a college advertising a high standard in its catalogue in order to gain a character, and then in fact paying no attention to it—such a college should be made to feel that it is losing all character. But there is a limit to be set to this elevation of standard, especially in States in which there are few Upper Schools. I do not believe that it would be for the good of education so to raise the standard as to make it difficult or impossible to enter college until the candidate is eighteen or twenty years of age. For, observe the necessary consequence:

Young men are not ready to begin, even to learn their professions, till they are twenty-two or twenty-four. Is this country ready to stand this? Is New York ready for it? Is Chicago ready for it? I believe such cities are ready to decide, if not to exclaim: "If such be your method, we will not send our sons to you." Are parents, are pupils ready for it anywhere? Can they afford to spend all this time before beginning even to learn occupations by which they are to earn their sustenance? The average years of man's life on earth are said to be between thirty and forty. Is it right to spend twenty-two or twenty-four of these in preparation for learning, and then three or four more in learning the business of life? It is said that the number of young men who go to our colleges, in proportion to the population, is diminishing. Is there not a risk of greater diminution? But it is said that a boy would be better at an academy till the age of eighteen or twenty than at a college. I dispute this. If our Upper Schools were what they should be, and were taught so to do by public opinion, they might have healthy youths ready for college by sixteen or seventeen; and the youth who had been all his previous life at a school with its drill, needs about that time of life a change, and when he enters college, with its greater freedom, he has a new life imparted; and when he enters the junior class at



the age of eighteen or nineteen, he has a still higher life imparted as he enters upon the duties which require independent thought ; and at the age of twenty or twenty-one, he is set out to learn his profession ere his muscles (mental) and his habits have become too stiff to learn what is to be the business of his life. I am sure that your merchants, your lawyers, your theological teachers, would tell you that they would rather have a pliable young man of twenty to instruct in their profession than a confirmed man of twenty-five with his ways all settled.

How, then, it is asked, do you propose to gain the end you reckon so important? Observe what is the end ; it is to train a few higher minds. I say a *few*, for I hold it to be impossible to make all students great scholars, great classical scholars, great mathematicians. No college, not Oxford, or Cambridge, or Berlin, has succeeded in doing this. Let us keep what we have got, and which is so good. Let us encourage the preparatory schools to send to our freshman class young men of the age of sixteen or seventeen. Let us give them the four years' wholesome instruction of the American colleges to make them all fair general scholars. Let us give them a choice of studies, always along with binding studies, in the junior and senior years. By this time the instructors know, and the students themselves know, who are fitted to be superior scholars. Let the ten per cent. or so, who have the taste or the talent, go on to higher studies, to special studies (as no man in these times can be a universal scholar). Let him give himself for a time to philology, to philosophy, to social science, or original research in one or the other of the various departments of physical science. Let encouragements be given to this by fellowships earned by competition, and held only by such as give evidence that they are devoting themselves to higher study. I venture to declare confidently, that on such a system you will in a few years add all the excellencies of the European to those of the American colleges, and produce a select body of scholars fit to match the first wranglers of Cambridge, the double first of Oxford, or the doctors of philosophy and the doctors of science of the scientific schools of Europe.

These preliminary remarks may seem somewhat removed from my proper subject. But they are not so much so as they might at first appear. If we had a set of well-educated inspectors visiting every country school, and interested in the boys, they would feel a

pride, and lead the teachers to feel a pride, in sending up promising boys to the secondary schools. The principal difficulty which the American colleges have to contend against, lies in the want of preparatory schools in most of the States of the Union, and in the deficient character of the training in many of those academies which propose to fit young men for college. The colleges ought to know that if they are to live and prosper, they have to encourage the institution of schools fitted to feed them.

The grand educational want of America at the present time, is a judiciously scattered body of secondary schools to carry on our brighter youths from what has been so well commenced in the primary schools, and may be so well completed in the better colleges. How are our young men to mount from the lower to the higher platform? Every one has heard of the man who built a very fine house of two stories, each large and commodious, but neglected to put a stair between. It appears to me that there has been a like mistake committed in most of the States of the Union. We need a set of intermediate schools to enable the abler youths of America to take advantage of the education provided in the college.

*Secondary Institutions in the United States.*

1. The statistics we have of the academies and high schools is very imperfect. The commissioner of education ought to be encouraged in his efforts to make these more complete, and to keep the subject of secondary instruction before the public.

2. The secondary schools are not organized as in some other countries. This, no doubt, is an advantage, considered under certain aspects. It would be wrong to discourage private enterprise; and we find, in fact, that some of the best academies in the country are under a small body of trustees.

3. While a high order of instruction is given in some of the academies and high schools, in many the branches taught are far too limited, and the standard aimed at in these branches is much too low. The very discussion of the subject will help to remove the evil, and may terminate in a more thorough organization.

4. The consequence of all this is, that there is a vast amount of talent lost to the country, in bright boys fitted to do good in the higher walks of life, in literature, in science, in statesmanship, or the church, being obliged to devote their life to manual occupa-

tions. I hold that the secondary school is the main means of calling forth talent in every country. It seizes the most promising boys at the primary schools and sends them up to college, or into the higher walks of life, where they have the means of distinguishing themselves and benefiting their country.

The question arises, what are we to do? I answer first, that we are to seek to lead the friends of education to see that there is a want, and when that is done the American public will find some way of meeting it. Two ways are open :

*Private Endowments,*

Provided by wealthy and generous individuals, or by public-spirited associations. Much may be done in this way.

*State and City Endowments.*

Many cities are already alive to this work of improving the rising generation. I know that there may be difficulties in persuading the States to establish such schools. But if the known friends of education will do their duty, and press the need on public notice—if this association will only give an impulse to the movement, I am sure that there are States which would begin the good work. I am aware that there may be religious difficulties. But these same difficulties meet us in elementary schools, and the friends of religion must be prepared to meet them in the one as they have done in the other.

At this point I venture, even at the risk of raising a discussion, which I know will be conducted in the right spirit, and may do much good, to start the question : What should be done with those ninety millions worth of unappropriated land belonging to the general government? We all know that a proposal was made in the last session of Congress to devote the whole or the half of the sum to be realized by the sale of these lands to what were called agricultural schools. The agricultural schools and the schools of science, which expected to receive a share of the funds, were employed for months in preparing and promoting this measure. Members of the Senate and the House were anxious to be able to go back on their constituents with the assurance, that they brought down with them to their State half a million of money, or \$50,000 a year. Friends of education were glad to get the sum allocated to some good educational end, were it only to prevent it from



being wasted in political jobbing. But some of us, when we learned that such a measure was quietly passing the House and Senate, courageously set ourselves against the allocation of so large a sum of money to so narrow and sectional a purpose. We argued, that so far as these schools were simply agricultural ones, they were not accomplishing so great a good as to entitle them to so large an endowment. I hold very resolutely, that before so large a sum be lavished on them, there should be a special inquiry into what they are, and what they are doing, into the number of *bona fide* agricultural pupils, and specially as to the number of those trained who have thought it worth their while to turn to farming. I could show that in no country in the world has agriculture been much benefited by mere agricultural schools. In Scotland, where the farming is so excellent, agriculture is promoted by farmers' associations with magazines and lectures, but not by special colleges. In all Germany there are only six agricultural colleges; and I can testify from personal visitation, that some of them are very feeble institutions. If a youth is bent on being a scientific agriculturist, let him go to an institution for general science, with a chair of agriculture attached, and let him learn the art on the farm. We are entitled to insist, that before agricultural schools receive the last gift of land which the general government has to bestow, they be examined and reported on by a competent commission.

But then it was urged, that many of the schools to be benefited were more than mere agricultural schools—they were schools of science and schools of technology. But this only raises other and perhaps more formidable objections. First, there is no evidence that some of these schools of science have produced a single agricultural student. Secondly, and more particularly, by allotting grants to certain scientific institutions and not to others, there is introduced a principle of partiality, and therefore of positive injustice. The allocations were to be reserved for those institutions which were so lucky as to get a previous grant in 1862. I am prepared to show that these allocations of 1862 were not always made to the best institutions of the country, and that an additional grant to them would be an additional injustice. It will in every way turn out to be best for the country and for education to put all our competing scientific schools on the same footing. The excellencies of Cornell University have been widely proclaimed

and are well known; I find that it graduated two agricultural students in June last, and I ask why it should receive half a million (after having got \$900,000), while the other colleges in New York State, not so well known but striving to give as high an education as Cornell, get nothing? The Senate of New York State decided that question when it was brought before them in the spring, by a vote of 29 to 1. Why should the agricultural school at Amherst get so large a sum, and Amherst College and Harvard College have no encouragement? We wish nothing in Princeton from the State or General Government. I proclaim this publicly. But we are entitled to demand in this country a fair field and no favor. We are ready to contend with all who are on the same footing, but we object to being obliged to contend with a subsidized institution. When you pamper one such institution in a State, you are, as much as within you lies, weakening all other institutions, and thus indirectly but powerfully hindering the cause which you meant to benefit.

I hold that so large a sum as that now at the disposal of the Government should be allotted fairly, not to denominational colleges, and just as little to those which are as sectarian as any, as they exclude all religion; that they should be allotted to institutions open to all, and giving instruction in branches useful not merely to sections of the people, such as farmers or engineers or mariners (if these, why not carpenters or masons also?) that all the people may receive profit. Another principle will, I hope, be attended to. I am sure it will be so by an educational association. I hold, with all the enlightened educationists of the world, that when public grants are given for education, above what is given in elementary schools, they should encourage the highest and also the lowest branches.

I don't propose that any portion of this ninety millions should be given to colleges. We cannot aid all, and to select a few would be injurious. In regard to elementary education, the Northern, the Middle, and the Western States are able and willing to do their duty. I venture to propose that in these the unappropriated lands be devoted to the encouragement of secondary schools. Let each State obtain its share, and the money be handed over to it under certain rigid rules and restrictions to prevent the abuse of the public money. In particular, to secure that Upper Schools be endowed only where needed, I suggest that money be allocated

only when a district, or it may be a combination of two or more districts, has raised a certain portion, say one-half, of the necessary funds. By this means the money may be made to stimulate the erection of high schools all over America. These schools would aid colleges far more powerfully than a direct grant to them, as in fact the grand difficulty which colleges have to contend against, arises from there being so few schools fitted to prepare young men for them with their rising standard of excellence. But I plead for these schools not merely as a means of feeding colleges, but as competent to give a high education in varied branches, literary and scientific, to a far greater number who do not go on to anything higher. These schools, like the elementary schools, should be open to all children, of the poor as well as the rich. They should be set up, like the German gymnasium, in convenient localities, so that all the population may have access to them. They should embrace every useful branch suited to young men and women under sixteen or eighteen years of age. English composition, English language, history, classics, modern language, and elementary science. The best scholars in our primary schools would be drafted up to these higher schools, and thus the young talent of the country would be turned to good account, while the teachers in the common schools would be encouraged by seeing their best pupils advance."

---

#### COLLEGE ITEMS.

*Three weeks* have passed since the resumption of our educational work. The *Fall Term* opened auspiciously at the time announced, September 1, and the large number of students pressing in on the first day of the term, plainly showed their gratification at the re-opening of the school. There has been an accession of more than twenty new students, and all are busily and earnestly at work in their respective classes.

The Academic Department, as reorganized, is giving increased satisfaction under the instructions of Professors *H. T. Spangler*, and *J. H. Seckler*, assisted by Messers. A. E. Dahlman and H. J. Welker.

Upwards of seventy names are on the Term list already, and



other students are still to come. Cheered by such indications of the favor of the Lord upon our cause, and of the interests and coöperation of many warm friends, those on whom the special responsibilities of the institution rest, feel greatly strengthened for their labors.

The Theological class for the present term consists of six members. Besides these, there are twenty-five students in the other departments of the institution who have the ministry in view.

*The two Literary Societies* of the College are displaying a commendable measure of honorable rivalry. There are the usual effort to secure additions from the new students coming in, and each Society succeeded in getting a fair share of "the game." Both are encouraged and prospering.

*Acknowledgments.* The following additional contributions to the *education aid fund* (beneficiary) are thankfully acknowledged:

Rev. Sorber (Brownback's S. S.),.....	\$18 55
Rev. E. J. Fogel, Fogelsville,.....	75 00
Rev. H. A. Keyser, Mahanoy city,.....	30 00
Mrs. Susan B. Good, Reading, Pa.,..	50 00
Rev. Dr. Kremer, Lebanon,.....	50 00

"*College Days*" on police duty. In the last number of *College Days*, published at Lancaster in the interest of Franklin and Marshall College, a writer takes the "Biennial" orator at the Commencement of Ursinus College, sharply to task for what he calls "poaching," that is using the thoughts of others in his address. The main point of the writer seems to be, however, not so much to make a point against the orator, as to make a point against Ursinus because he was the orator. The whole introduction, by its sarcastic flings, shows the sparkling venom of the writer against an institution which must have loomed into the importance of a rival to receive so much notice. Let us examine whether the point against Ursinus has been well defined.

This very address, to which the writer refers, was delivered before Franklin and Marshall College at the laying of the corner stone of the Goethean Hall, July 22, 1856. A few sentences have been re-written, but nearly the whole address, word for word, was presented to the College, and printed in pamphlet form. Now, by priority of possession and claim, the address belongs to Frank-

lin and Marshall rather than to Ursinus. Why then did not some champion pitch into the address when it was first delivered? Why were silence and profound respect paid to it when it was delivered before the students at Lancaster, and applause sent up at the close; but when the same address is delivered at Ursinus, Franklin and Marshall opens its batteries of attack and attempts to riddle it through and through? The animus is apparent. Petty jealousy against a youthful rival has stirred the ink and moved the pen. And who is the orator so decried by *College Days*? Is he not a graduate of the institution whose championship has been assumed by the writer? In attacking the graduates of his own college, does he think that he is injuring Ursinus? His assassin poignard, by unskillful use, has injured the hand that plunged it. Was *College Days* established to depreciate the graduates of Franklin and Marshall? \*

*Stealing Chickens.* An item in *College Days*, the special patron of Franklin and Marshall in Lancaster, reports with a flourish, that among the number of new students received this fall, were two from Ursinus College. Probably had *College Days* known a little more about the case, it would have bragged less loudly. One of the two captives fell so far below the class average, that he could not have gotten into the Freshman class. The other was likewise below the average, although offered admission to the Freshman class on probation. Does *College Days* think it adds much to the reputation of Franklin and Marshall that its standard of scholarship is so low? Then, again: How did these students get to Lancaster? Were they stolen? Does Lancaster live by poaching? If it does, we think it had better take care the next time not to catch *lame ducks*. A FRESHMAN.

---

THE religious corporations in Italy refuse to fill up the forms sent to them by which inquiries about their members and their property are made. They are firmly resolved to yield only to force, and have only given verbal declarations under protest.

## EDITOR'S DESK.

*It would afford us much pleasure to change the date on the label of many delinquent subscribers from January, '70, or January, '71, &c., as the case may be, to January, '74. Let this gentle hint suffice.*

Recent events seem to have produced a powerful effect in certain directions. It is more amusing, in some respects, than gratifying, to notice the awkward attempts made by a class of theologians to vindicate their Reformed Protestantism. It is hard for Frenchmen to pronounce English, but more difficult for those who are at heart and in head, Iowa Lutherans or old Romanists, to speak and write evangelical articles on apostolic Reformed doctrines. Thistles yield doubtful figs, and hawthorn berries will hardly pass for good grapes, among those who have ever tasted clusters from eschol.

*An explanation which needs several corrections.* In an article recently published, Dr. T. G. Apple (we surmise) professes to correct a statement made by him some time previously, which seemed to charge the Editor of the *Catholic Standard* and us, with being in collusion with each other in assailing Mercersburg theology and Nevinism. Dr. A. says he did not mean *that* in what he said, and hopes that his disclaimer will be received.

Unfortunately for him, he makes statements in his card of correction and explanation, more false and unjust than that he attempts to correct. For these we must call him to account.

1. He says the "Editor of the *Catholic Standard* (whom our readers know to be G. D. Wolff) is *furnishing articles for*" a party in the Reformed church. To whom he refers by a *party*, will probably not be questioned. The only impression which the assertion can make, whether intended or not, is that G. D. Wolff, esq., is writing articles for said *party*, and that said party is receiving and publishing said articles so furnished. This is "not truthful." And as Dr. A. professes a ruling desire to be truthful, he will not hesitate to make the proper correction.

2. Again, he characterizes said *party* as a "*disaffected party* in the Reformed church." But one sense will be attached to this statement, whatever Dr. A. may have intended for it, viz., *that the party is disaffected towards the Reformed church.* Now Dr. A. knows that no such disaffection exists in the breast of said party. He knows that the only disaffection of said party, is towards those individuals in the church who are teaching and maintaining views believed and proven to be contrary to the faith of the Reformed church, and subversive of that faith. He knows that if said party has shown itself to be "zealously affected" for any thing, it has been for the defence and maintenance of the faith and historical character of the Reformed church, against attempts radically to change both.

Now, *knowing this*, and declaring himself very anxious to be "truthful," Dr. A. will of course promptly correct the mistake.

3. Again: Dr. A. asserts of this party, that "*they* circulate his paper (the



*Catholic Standard*) in our church." Now, so far as we know, (and the charge, if correct, implies that we do know,) this statement is *exceedingly* "not truthful." Dr. A. must have been very much misinformed. And unless he can support his assertion *by facts*, we hold him to his avowal, and expect a ready correction of the mistake. He will make it, of course, for he would not intentionally misrepresent even *that "party!"*

*A correction which needs explanation.* This is the reverse, in part, of the case just noticed. It involves, also, a far more serious matter, as will presently be seen :

Either Dr. T. G. Apple, or Dr. E. V. Gerhart, or some one else whom "the Faculty of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster" endorse, charges "*a certain writer*" with a very grave offence.

The name of the accused is not given, only he is called "*a certain writer*," for which compliment he is duly thankful, since he would much rather be a *certain* writer than an *uncertain* one of the L.-M. stamp.

Neither is the name given of the place or *publication* where the alleged offence was perpetrated. This omission may also be taken as complimentary, for names of persons or things highly esteemed should not be made common by too frequent use.

Now this *certain* writer is charged with being guilty of somewhere *suppressing* a Question of the Heidelberg Catechism from a very wrong motive. The Question said to be suppressed, is the 88th, and reads: "In how many parts doth the true conversion of man consist?" Or, as it is in German, "In how many parts doth the true repentance or conversion of man consist?"

This Question the *certain* writer is charged with *suppressing*, because, by giving it, he would have frustrated his purpose. "*It would show*" (says the accuser) "*that the language quoted*" (that is, the answer to the question) "*has no reference to regeneration.*" ! !

To this it may be replied, *first*, that the *uncertain* accuser ought to be very careful how he charges a gentleman with willfully suppressing official matter, or he might get himself into trouble. And publishers of such grave accusations ought likewise to be on their guard, or they might some day find themselves rather unpleasantly arraigned for libel. Some persons are very sensitive on such points, and ready to fly to the protection of law on the slightest provocation, especially if they are not very particular about slandering others, or allowing them to be slandered.

But, *secondly*, it may be answered that the accusation is *not truthful*, in *fact*, though it may be in *form*. The Question was, indeed, not quoted in *form*; but a reason for this is given in the immediate correction, viz: That as the term *conversion* is used synonymously with *regeneration* by our old Confessions and theologians, there was, impliedly, no need for quoting it. That is, there is no omission or suppression of any thing essential to the point discussed.

This now leads us to the main thing in the accusation, and that which greatly needs explanation.

The Theological Faculty at Lancaster assert, that the 88th Question of the Heidelberg Catechism "HAS NO REFERENCE TO REGENERATION."

Ursinus says *it has*. Under the first head (1) in his comment on it (see Williard's edition, page 468, &c.,) he quotes as directly pertinent to it (John 3: 5), "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Under the second head he says, "The Latins have a number of words by which they express the same thing. They call it REGENERATIO, &c., &c., &c." And again: "Conversion embraces the whole, as it adds *that which is the beginning of a new life by faith.*" Under the third head he says: "The new man which is quickened, is he who begins to depart from sin, or, *it is the nature of man as regenerated.*" And all through Ursinus assumes this same thing.

The same is true of all the early Reformed standards. *They always included regeneration under conversion*, and treated of it as the first part of conversion. (See MONTHLY for September, pp. 468, &c.)

Are the members of the Theological Faculty in Lancaster *masters "in Israel, and know not these things?"*

So, indeed, it seems. Ursinus and all the Reformed fathers say that this 88th Question and answer do teach regeneration. But Drs. Apple, Gerhart, &c., say they don't. And they charge a certain writer with attempting fraudulently to insert into said Question and answer a doctrine which does not belong there!

Who are right? The authors and early expounders of the Catechism, or the Theological Faculty at Lancaster? No intelligent member of the Reformed church will hesitate to say.

But this is a serious matter. The Theological Faculty at Lancaster have no right to be so ignorant of the doctrine of the Reformed church. They have no right to let their eyes be so blinded, or their understandings be so warped by Iowa Lutheranism, by Puseyism, or by Popery, as to be unable to see and discern what is plainly written in the standards of the Reformed church. They ought to know better. And if they don't, why let them ask for a week's respite from their toils, and come to Ursinus Theological Department for a few days. Our theological juniors will soon set them right. This, however, they might not like to do. Suppose, then, our friend Dr. Williard send them a copy of Ursinus' Commentary as a Christmas gift, as they seem not to have one, so that they may devote the next vacation to a careful study of the book, than which "*no other, at all events, can have the same weight as an exposition of the true meaning*" of the Heidelberg Catechism.

*Attention, Dr. Good!* You are charged by the Reverend Theological Faculty at Lancaster, with perpetrating a ludicrously stupid blunder, in calling baptism "*an outward rite.*"

What have you to say, sir?

*Very amusing* is the witticism attempted by the same Theological Faculty aforesaid, in the following extract. With reference to our *article third* on Dr. Nevin and his antagonists, it is said, after shirking and misrepresenting its main points: "Dr. Bomberger was then (that is, when the articles of 1853 were written) in the prime of life, and gifted with some power of intelligence. If h

confesses now that he was entirely unable to understand\* Dr. Nevin *then* there is room for a strong suspicion that he does not understand him *now*." Is that not smart, ludicrous, logical? Perhaps it might furnish matter for two laughs. Let us see:

The articles of 1853 were written by the person named, in his 35th year. That, according to the Theological Faculty of Lancaster, was the prime of his life. Hence, a man is in his prime at 35. If he ever has any sense he will show it then. It is the period when a man's intelligence may be considered most vigorous and mature. Whatever he holds and advocates then, may be appealed to in full refutation of any contrary opinions he may subsequently advance. Thus teaches the logic of the Theological Faculty at Lancaster. If good in one case, it must apply to others.

Now let us see how this amusing logic works.

In 1840 Dr. J. W. Nevin was just in the full ripeness of the period of a man's life, assumed to be the best for intellectual vigor. In his inaugural address of that year he said some very fine things about the close confessional relationship between the different branches of the Reformed family, and of Protestantism generally, under that aspect. Some time afterwards he changed his tone materially, especially in his articles on Dr. Hodge, on Ephesians, the Dutch Crusade, &c. Now apply your logic, gentlemen; apply your logic, and laugh a little if you please.

In 1850-51, one of the present members of the Theological Faculty at Lancaster was connected with another institution. In that position he declared it as his opinion, that the tendency of Mercersburg theology was decidedly Romanizing (as one of his students, now residing somewhat northeast of our present abode, informed us). Since then, said Professor has very much changed his mind, his speech, and his writing. Then he was about 35; now he is 56. Apply your logic, brethren; apply your logic, and take another laugh.

If any more similarly pleasant illustrations are wanted, they can be supplied. The *Desk* has a drawer full of them.

*Contemptible* hints, and what might be fairly called by a severer name, in more Saxon English, have been thrown out publicly by some parties, to the effect that we are in some sort of compact with the editor of the *Catholic Standard*, G. D. Wolff, Esq., against Lancaster-Nevinism. The charge is too absurd to need refutation. Mr. Wolff repelled it, so far as he is involved in it, in terms which brought a blush to Dr. T. G. Apple's cheek.

For ourselves, we deem it beneath any further notice than to pronounce it utterly and maliciously false.

The article copied into the MONTHLY from the *Standard*, last August, was copied as furnishing irresistible proof of what we have often asserted, that Lancaster-Mercersburg Nevinism leads to Rome. It contains the confession of one who was, as he declares, led to his conversion, as he calls it (we call it apostasy), by the lessons he learned of Dr. Nevin and his theological adjutants.

---

\* Nothing of the sort is confessed; and it is "not truthful" to say it is. Moreover, the writer knew that he was not truthfully representing the tenor of the article to which he alludes.



No fair or honest attempt has been made to answer or refute that testimony. The Theological Faculty at Lancaster seem unable to answer it. But why should they, in their desperation, resort to the lowest of devices to screen themselves from the consequences of their own folly?

We will make another statement. Not only is the above charge utterly untruthful, but we have had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with the publication of Mr. Forpey's apostasy, or anything connected with it, in any secular paper, excepting the articles in the *Lancaster Express* and *Easton Express*, over our own full signature. And any hint or assertion to the contrary is wholly and calumniously false.

Lancaster-Nevinism is responsible for the fruits of its own planting; and if it were honorable and truthful, it would not try to hide its wounded head behind foully false insinuations and charges, like some of those contained in articles which have appeared under the title of "*Theology and Criticism*."

A movement which feels driven to the use of such means of defense, and is capable of using them, thereby proves its paternity and foretokens its doom.

#### A DARK LIST.

That all concerned may see at a glance how many ministers and members of our church have been led astray by the errors and influence of the New-order, ritualistic, or Romanizing party, headed by Mercersburg and Lancaster, we publish the following list of persons who have thus far apostatized or defected. The list is not complete. All the cases of apostasy and defection are, of course, not known to us. From considerations of courtesy, we do not give the names of females who have defected. As new cases occur, their names will be added; and any mistake in the list will be promptly corrected, on information given:

#### *Apostasies to Rome.*

*David Snively*, whilst a student at Mercersburg.

*Peter Coblentz*, a student at Mercersburg.

*Rev. Moses A. Stewart* (and wife?), formerly of Burkettsville, Md.

*Rev. John Wagner and wife*, formerly of Pittsburg, Pa.

*Miss ———*, Hagerstown, Md.

" " " Easton, Pa.

" " " Lancaster, Pa.

*Rev. Geo. Dering Wolff and wife*, Norristown, Pa.

*Rev. John S. Ermentrout*, formerly of Norristown, Pa.

*Prof. Chas. Budd*, not a member of the Reformed church, but a student of Mercersburg, and at the time of his apostasy, a professor in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.

*John Oliver, Esq.*, (a nephew of the Drs. Apple), of Allentown, Pa.

*Rev. E. O. Forney*, of Norristown, Pa.

*Rev. Wm. Phillips*, formerly pastor in Mercersburg. He first joined the Episcopal church, and then took the full step.

#### *Defections to the (Puseyite) Episcopal Church.*

*Rev. Aaron Christman*, formerly of Huntingdon, Pa.

*Lewis Zahner*, while a student at Franklin and Marshall, Lancaster.

— *Nevin*, son of Dr. J. W. Nevin, Lancaster.

*Rev. Robt. Nevin*, son of Dr. J. W. Nevin, now in the Episcopal chapel in Rome.

*Miss ———*, Lancaster, Pa.

*Rev. S. H. Giesy, D.D., and wife*, formerly of Christ church, Philadelphia.

*Rev. H. F. Hartman*, formerly of St. Paul's Classis.

Two sons of the Rev. M. Kieffer, D.D.

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia:

"*The Teacher's Commentary on the Gospel Narrative of the last days of Jesus.*" By Henry C. McCook, minister of the Gospel.

As stated on the title-page, this work has been prepared for teachers of the Word of God in Sabbath-school classes, Lecture rooms, private schools, and families. The author has devoted himself for some time to the preparation of such volumes, and displays special fitness for the service. This Commentary on the most solemn and momentous part of our Lord's state of humiliation, will be found highly useful for those for whom it has been more particularly written, and equally valuable for private use.

*The Communion Table.* The approach—The Service—The Retrospect. By the Rev. James R. Boyd, D.D. Price 50 cents.

The plates of this delightful little manual for communicants have been presented to the Board by the author, and the book is now published in a style neat and attractive, yet not costly. To Christians who would quicken the pulse of spiritual life when coming to the Lord's table, it will prove a welcome helper. The gift of a copy to those newly professing faith in Christ, would be most appropriate and helpful.

*The Story of Madagascar.* Rev. John W. Mears, D.D., author of the "Beggars of Holland," "Martyrs of France," &c.

The history of the Gospel is not romantic, it is tragic, but it is marked by some of the most wonderful displays of divine grace, and some of the most remarkable instances of Christian heroism recorded in these latter times. This volume, prepared by a competent hand, gives a running account of the necessities of the work of God in the island, and shows that the grace of God is mighty to subdue the hearts of men, and even to transform nations.

*Arthur Bonnicastle—An American Novel.* By J. G. Holland. Scribner, Armstrong & Co., New York. For sale by Lippincott & Co.

This is fitly styled an *American* novel, for it inculcates a lesson in which Americans most thoroughly believe, that of self-reliance. Perhaps we need no

more instruction on this point. The position is enforced by showing the evils arising from a want of this quality of character in the person of Arthur Bonnicastle. Novel readers take to a bad man much more readily than a good one. The book is more attractive, as the form and part of the material are autobiographical. Dr. Holland is a popular author and a writer of vigorous prose; and here and there we light on passages of real beauty, or of deep and genuine pathos.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.—*Rev. Jacob Hassler*, from Boonsboro', Md., to Mercersburg, Pa.

*Rev. John Ault*, from Mechanicsburg to Littlestown, Adams county, Pa.

*Rev. C. Pluss*, from Crothersville to Calvin Institute, Cleveland, Ohio.

*Rev. H. Troutman's* address is in care of Prof. Buch, Anstalt, Scranton Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

*Rev. T. Grosshusch*, from Newtonburg, Wis., to Lanesville, Ind.

*Rev. N. H. Skyles*, from Schellsburg to Man's Choice, Bedford county, Pa.

*Rev. J. Krie*, Preston, Waterloo county, Canada West.

*Rev. J. R. Shepler*, from Lake, Ohio, to Nimisila, Summit county, Ohio.

ADDITION TO CHURCHES.—Seventeen persons were added to the congregation at Harrisburg, Pa., *Rev. George W. Snyder*, pastor. Thirteen persons were added to St. John's Reformed church, Middlebrook, Va., *Rev. W. C. B. Schulenberg*, pastor.

INSTALLATION.—*Rev. Joseph H. Apple* was installed pastor of the Saegerstown charge, August 19th.

DEDICATIONS.—The new church at Titusville was dedicated Sunday, August 17th. The ministerial brethren present were *Kniest*, of Buffalo, *Ernst* and *Apple*, of Saegerstown, and assisted the pastor in conducting the services.

On the tenth Sunday after Trinity, a fine new church, in Amityville, was solemnly dedicated.

DEATHS IN THE MINISTRY.—Two more watchmen have been summoned from their posts on the walls of Zion to an abode of rest in the heavenly Jerusalem.

The *Rev. Theobald Fouse*, for many years pastor of the Woodcock Valley charge, in Huntingdon county, Pa., departed on August 22d, at the ripe age of nearly seventy-one years. This esteemed brother and zealous workman of the Lord, entered the ministry after he was somewhat advanced in life, and, partly, at least, through the influence and encouragement of the *Rev. Christian Winebrenner*. We remember the occasion, and some of the circumstances. He had



not enjoyed the advantages of an early education, or of academic discipline. But his deficiencies in this respect, always felt and meekly acknowledged, were largely compensated for by natural talent for preaching, a thorough practical acquaintance with the Scriptures, and ardent piety. His case is one of those which prove the wisdom of not enforcing too rigidly the requirement of high literary qualifications for the sacred office. Brother Fouse was among the most efficient ministers in the Reformed church, and very successful in his work, as the growth of the congregation within his charge showed. His memory will be cherished by many who were brought to the Lord through his instrumentality. To the last he remained firm in the faith of the Gospel he had ever preached. It was our privilege to see him only a short time before his death, and we found him hopeful and confident in the grace of the Lord.

The Rev. John William Hoffmeier, departed August 30th, 1873, aged 65 years and 6 months. His death took place in Manchester, Md., where he had been laboring as pastor of the charge nearly eleven years. He was the youngest child of the Rev. John Henry Hoffmeier, for twenty years pastor of the First German Reformed church in Lancaster, where the subject of this notice was born.

Having in early life been led to devote himself to the Lord in the service of the ministry of reconciliation, he pursued his preparatory classical studies in the Academy at Lancaster, then under the care of James P. Wilson, (now Rev. Dr. Wilson, of Newark, N. J.,) and commenced his theological course under the tuition of his father's intimate personal friend, the Rev. J. C. Baker, D.D., of the first Lutheran church. He subsequently finished his theological training in the Seminary at York, under the Rev. L. Mayer, D.D., for whom he ever cherished a warm regard. After entering the ministry he successively served several charges in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, finishing his course at last not far from the field where he had begun his ministerial work.

As a Christian man he won the esteem of all who learned to know him, by his urbanity and sincere piety. As a preacher, he proved ever acceptable to the congregations he was called to serve. And as a pastor, his diligence and fidelity were rewarded with cheering success. Besides lamenting his death as a loss to the church, we mourn over it as the removal of a near and beloved relative.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—*The Evangelical Alliance* to convene in New York City, on Friday, October 3d, promises to be a convention of great and momentous interest for Apostolic Christianity. For a month past many foreign delegates have been arriving, and the attendance will not only be large, but highly influential. This influence will prove all the more potent for not depending upon any fictitious magnificence of grandly titled hierarchists, but as springing from the true greatness of sanctified learning and sincere piety. The following order of services, &c., has been adopted :

*Friday, October 3d, 1873.*—Madison Square church, 9 a. m. Devotional service; and the same every morning at the same hour. Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Organization of the Conference, and reports on the present state of Christendom.

*Saturday, October 4.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Christian Union."

*Sunday, October 5.*—Preaching in various churches by foreign delegates. Academy of Music, 7½ p. m. Addresses by foreign delegates.

*Monday, October 6.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Christianity and its Antagonisms." Association Hall, 7½ p. m. Addresses in the French language.

*Tuesday, October 7th.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Christian Life." Broadway Tabernacle, 7½ p. m. Addresses by foreign delegates.

*Wednesday, October 8.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Protestantism and Romanism." Brooklyn Academy of Music, 7½ p. m. Addresses by foreign delegates and others.

*Thursday, October 9.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Christianity and Civil Government." Church of the Disciples, (Dr. Hepworth's), 7½ p. m. Addresses by foreign delegates and others.

*Friday, October 10.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Christian Missions—Foreign and Domestic." Association Hall, 7½ p. m. Addresses in the German language.

*Saturday, October 11.*—Association Hall, 10 a. m., and 2 p. m. Subject for the day—"Christianity and Social Reforms."

*Sunday, October 12.*—Preaching in various churches by foreign ministers and others. Academy of Music, 7:30 p. m., closing service of the Conference, with addresses and prayers in the several languages represented.

To all the meetings admission is *free*. A limited number of *reserved seats* are sold (\$10 each). As admissions are necessarily restricted to the capacity of the houses, tickets will be furnished gratuitously at the door, in the order of application.

The morning sessions of the Conference close at 1 o'clock p. m., when *refreshments* are served in the upper lecture-room of the Association Hall, *free* to all members of the Conference. Others (ladies and gentlemen) may purchase tickets daily at the hall.

The afternoon sessions will begin at 2 o'clock, and close at 5.

*Social Reception.*—The delegates to the Evangelical Alliance are to have a reception given to them in the parlors of the Young Men's Christian Association, on Thursday evening, October 2nd, at 7 o'clock. After an hour or two of social intercourse and refreshments, an address of welcome will be made by Rev. Dr. William Adams, and responses by one or two from each foreign country represented. A limited number of cards of admission to the reception may be obtained (\$2 each) at Randolph's, 770 Broadway, and at Association Hall, any time before the 2nd of October.—*New York Observer*.

WM. PAINTER & CO.,  
BANKERS,  
No. 36 SOUTH THIRD STREET,  
PHILADELPHIA.

---

DEALERS IN ALL ISSUES OF  
GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.


---

Gold, Stocks and Bonds

BOUGHT AND SOLD ON COMMISSION,

AT THE  
*PHILADELPHIA AND NEW YORK STOCK BOARDS.*

---

 Deposits received and Interest allowed by special agreement.

---

MORNING SUNBEAMS

For the playroom, Schoolroom, and Nursery. Selected by Mrs. E. Prentiss for the little folks, to hang on their chamber and schoolroom walls, like the "Silent Comforter" in hospitals, and furnish a divine talisman for every day. Folio. 32 pp. 75c.; post. 10c.

PRAYER.

A new and attractive devotional manual, containing suggestions and hints from our best writers, on the Lord's Prayer, and prayer in general. 104 pp. large 32mo. 20c.; post 4c.

THE TEMPTATION IN THE DESERT.

Lessons from Christ's conflict and victory. By Rev. A. F. Dickson. The teacher of youth, the tempted and the troubled Christian, will find it valuable. 144 pp. 18mo. 40c.; post 8c.

American Tract Society, Penna. Branch,

H. N. THISSELL,  
1408 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.



# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

FALL TERM. 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The FALL TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, commences Monday SEPTEMBER, 1, 1873, and continues sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 4 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

H. T. SPANGLER, A. B., and J. H. SECHLER, A. B., Instructors in the Academic Department.

A. E. DAHLMAN, Tutor.

H. J. WELKER, Instructor in Penmanship.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.—NOVEMBER, 1873.—No. 11.

---

THE GROUND OF OUR SALVATION.

THIS was a favorite expression with our early Reformed fathers. It occurs in the Heidelberg Catechism. It is repeated, with the addition of the term "foundation," in the Palatinate Directory of public worship, which was published in the same year with the Catechism, and had the full endorsement of the same church authorities and theologians. It is frequently met with in the early doctrinal and other writings of the church.

The phrase was used to express a fact and truth, and both in what was evidently regarded as a most important sense. By its use our fathers meant to designate something *fundamentally essential to the entire purpose and plan of redemption*. Whatever else might be lightly esteemed, this was to be regarded as vital. Whatever else might be misapprehended or variously understood and taught, this must be accepted without qualification, and without modification, in its obviously plain and single sense.

What does the phrase mean? What did our Reformed fathers mean to teach by it? What has the church for three hundred years always understood it to mean? And what does it teach us to consider and undoubtingly to accept as the ground, as the chief ground and foundation of our salvation?

Let each of these questions, separately and successively, claim our earnest attention. Then having answered them fairly and frankly, we may be prepared for a few plain inferences, by way of direct practical application.

It is assumed, first of all, that man's salvation must have a solid basis, a certain and sufficient ground.

The terms used are figurative, but the sense is clear. No deep-sounding, affectedly profound or learned definitions or expositions are needed to enable us to grasp the fact and truth set forth by them. One of the terms, at least, "foundation," has been made familiar to us by its frequent use in the Holy Scriptures. All know that it is taken from architecture. A house rests, as such, ultimately, on its foundation. The foundation is the first and lowest part of the edifice, on which the entire superstructure rests, and by which all else is supported.

In the case of an ordinary house, however, this foundation must be placed on something deeper and broader than itself. Hence it is built upon the *ground*. And for safety, a solid place in the ground is sought, or the surface-earth even dug away until rock is reached, and the foundation is built on that.

So Jesus Christ is spoken of as the foundation of His people, the church, and of all that pertains to them as His people, in the way of grace and of truth. Only Christ as the foundation includes in Himself the *ground* also, so far as He is one with the Father, God manifest in the flesh, for the purpose for which He declares He became incarnate.

Hence, in accordance with the Scriptures, and with the faith of the true church of all times, our Reformed fathers held and taught that He is the *ground and foundation* of our salvation. Whoever, therefore, would be saved, must (speaking in accordance with this simple and instructive figure) be built on Him. That is, they must renounce all other hope of salvation, and believe, trust in, rely on Him alone for their salvation. It is by a personal trust in Him as a personal Redeemer, that they must be saved.

*But this is not all.* It is not merely by looking unto, and trusting in, the *person of Christ*, considered abstractly, or in Himself as such a mere person, that men are saved. And they who talk, preach, or write, as if this were all required by the command to believe in Him, or as if in some such abstract sense He saved men by the mere constitution of His person as the word incarnate, stop short of the whole truth in the case. They really nullify or misrepresent the gospel of redemption by Christ, in this way, by giving only one half of it.

We adore the incarnate babe in the manger; we reverently



admire the youth Jesus as He disputed so wisely with the scribes in the temple ; we cry : Hosanna to the Son of David, as he rode in triumph into Jerusalem. But there would have been no opportunity for our doing either, *had He not done something else.* And that something else is declared throughout the whole Gospel to have been the great, and contemplated as the main essential thing, by every event which preceded it.

This our Reformed fathers well understood. They also understood the fundamental importance of the fact. *Hence they emphasize* so strongly, as well they might do, and so pressingly insist upon it.

From the Gospel itself they learned their lessons of the Gospel concerning the person of Christ. What they learned they taught. And what they taught may be summed up in a few simple statements :

1. Any correct view of the person of Christ must take in His peculiar and special work. His person and His work cannot be separated in the matter of man's redemption. His person, as God manifest in the flesh, as the Word incarnate, and all of divine grace and human perfection, which pertained to Him as such, was in order to His mediatorial work. No one ever rightly viewed Him as the Messiah, the Son of the living God, the Christ, who did not see Him as the atoning Lamb of God.

2. His redemptive work, in its last, fullest and truly saving sense, was His propitiatory, atoning death upon the cross. *There* He died for the ungodly ; *there* He " bore our sins in His body on the tree ;" *there* He " redeemed us not with corruptible things, \* \* but with His precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." He "*died*, the just for the unjust, *that He might bring us to God.*"

3. Hence, the entire Gospel, both by its word and ordinances (baptism and the Lord's Supper), points sinners not to Christ Jesus as a person apart, as it were, from this chief end of His advent, but to " Christ and *Him crucified.*" *On this ground* Paul gloried in the *cross* of Christ. Did Paul ignore His birth, His incarnation, " the constitution " of His person ? Far from it. But as he learned Christ, it was in Him as our passover, as our propitiation by His sacrificial death, that he trusted for his own salvation, and taught, and besought others to trust.

Theology may distinguish between the person and this atoning,

redemptive work of the person of Christ. But to faith, to saving faith, they are and must be united—inseparably united.

4. Wherefore our Reformed fathers, not only in the Heidelberg Catechism, but everywhere declare, in entire accordance with the Gospel, that the atoning death of Christ upon the cross is, in this fullest, deepest sense, *the ground and foundation of our salvation*. It is not the atoning sacrifice of the cross, abstractly considered, or considered apart from His person (were this conceivable), that constitutes this ground. Nobody ever said it did; nobody ever taught it did. To intimate or charge that any one has ever done so, is to raise a false or imaginary issue, for the purpose of showing off argument in a feigned refutation of it. But it is that atoning sacrifice, as made by Him. It is *Christ*, as "*offering* Himself thus once for all for our sins," who is this ground and foundation.

That this was the doctrine of the Reformed church from the first, might be proven by pages of quotations from earlier and later writers, even within our limited reach. Let one suffice, in addition to the few given in a previous number of the MONTHLY. It is from the work of *Olevianus*, on the "Difference between the Gospel and the Law." In answer to the question, Why do we pass immediately from the consideration of the birth of Christ to His passion and death, and say nothing about His life? he says: "*Because, in this brief confession of our faith, we include only that which properly concerns the ground and substance of our redemption.*" (Sudhoff's *Olevianus*, p. 548).

The emphasis thus given to the atoning death of Christ is not to be explained by asserting that it was done as an offset to the Romish doctrine of the Mass, &c. Doubtless that and other Romish errors were had in view. But there was a more important, *positive* reason for the emphasis. It was to give due prominence to the cardinal doctrine of the Gospel on this subject. This is proven by the whole connection and manner in which the doctrine is set forth.

#### *Some Inferences.*

1. If the faith of our Reformed fathers on this subject is in harmony with the Gospel, as it must be admitted to be, let us hold fast to it.

2. If any among us have been tempted by their vain and mis-

leading speculations, to wander from this faith, let them take alarm at their error, retrace their steps, and return heartily again to the good old Gospel faith.

3. If any thus misled refuse so to return, let them be frank and candid enough to confess that they can no longer accept the doctrine of the Reformed church as true, and must henceforth hold and teach another Gospel than that which our church maintains. Then, whoever might deplore their departure from the true faith, all would honor their honesty in openly acknowledging that they have felt constrained to renounce it. All are free to follow their convictions; but none have a right to hold those convictions under false pretenses.

---

THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

CHAPTER XXVI.

*Of the Burial of Believers, Care for the Dead, Purgatory, and  
Appearing of Spirits.*

THE Holy Scriptures will that the bodies of believers, as being temples of the Holy Spirit, and which at the last day shall rise again, shall be honestly, and without any superstition, committed to the earth; and besides, that we should make honorable mention of those who have fallen asleep in the Lord, and perform the duties of piety to those they leave behind, such as their widows and orphans. Any other care for the dead we do not teach. Therefore, we greatly condemn the Cynics who neglect the bodies of the dead, or disdainfully cast them into the earth, saying no good even of the deceased, or not in the least regarding those whom they leave behind.

Again, we do not condemn the moderate sorrow, which the apostle also does not condemn in 1 Thess. 4: 13, 14; and we think it hardly human not to be touched with any sorrow. But we condemn those who are too excessively and untimely concerned about the dead, and sorrow over them like the heathen, or make sacrifices for the dead, or mumble forth certain prayers for hire, thinking by such like services and complaints for the



dead to deliver their friends out of the torments into which they have fallen after death. *For we believe that the pious at once after the death of the body, go to Christ*, and therefore do not stand in need of either the prayers or intercessions of the living for the dead, or any of such duties.

Likewise, we believe that the ungodly are at once thrust into hell, from whence there is no return opened to them by any service of the living.

As regards what some teach concerning purgatory, this contradicts the Christian faith, namely, "*I believe the forgiveness of sins and the life everlasting.*" It contradicts the full purification through Christ, and the assurances of the Lord on the subject (John 5: 24), "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, *but is passed from death unto life.*" And (John 13: 10) "he that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean."

And as to what has been recorded concerning spirits, or the souls of the dead, that they sometimes appeared to the living, and asked certain duties from them for their deliverance—these things we regard as sport, or craft and deceit of the devil, who, as he can transform himself into an angel of light, exerts himself also to overthrow the true faith, or else plunge it into doubt. In the Old Testament the Lord forbade that they should seek the truth through the dead, and to have anything to do with the spirits (Deut. 18: 10, 11). And to the rich man, when he was in torments, his return to his brethren was forbidden, as the Gospel relates, since the divine Word speaks plainly enough. (Luke 16: 30, 31).

#### CHAPTER XXVII.

##### *Of Customs, Ceremonies, and Things Indifferent.*

Unto the ancient people were given, in old time, certain ceremonies, as a kind of schooling for those who were kept under the law, as under a schoolmaster. But Christ, the Redeemer, having come, and fulfilled and abolished the law, we believers are no longer under the law (Rom. 6: 14), and the ceremonies have vanished away. The apostles did not wish to preserve them in the church of Christ, and plainly testify that they will not lay any burden upon the church (Acts 15: 28).

We would, therefore, regard ourselves as again setting up Judaism, if we should multiply ceremonies and rites in the church of Christ, according to the manner of the church of the old covenant. Therefore, we do by no means accord with the opinions of those who think that the church of Christ must be kept within bounds, and a sort of schooling, through many and manifold rites. For, if the apostles would not impose upon the Christian people the ceremonies and rites which had been *divinely appointed*, what rational person would impose upon them *human* inventions? The greater the heap of ceremonies in the church increases, the more is taken away, not only from Christian liberty, but also from Christ and faith in Him—in that the people seek from the rites that which they should seek through faith in the one Son of God, Jesus Christ. For the pious, a few simple, moderate rites are sufficient, such as agree with the Word of God.

But when dissimilar rites are found in the churches, no one should conclude from this that the churches are on that account at variance. Socrates says: "It were not possible to set down in writing the ceremonies of all the churches, which are here and there in cities and countries. No religious party holds to the same ceremonies, although the same doctrine is accepted by them—since even those who hold the same faith disagree with each other in ceremonies."

We, also, who at the present day make use of different customs in our churches, in the celebration of the supper and some other things, do not disagree in faith; and neither the unity nor the communion of our churches is hereby destroyed. The churches have always made use of their liberty in such customs, as things indifferent. So we also do.

But yet we admonish men not to regard as things indifferent (or adiaphoristic) the Mass, and the use of pictures in the church, as some do. Certainly, these are not things indifferent. "That is indifferent (said Jerome to Augustine), which is neither good nor evil; so that whether you do it or not, you neither fulfill righteousness nor unrighteousness." Therefore, when things indifferent are taken for a confession of faith, they cease to be free, as Paul says (1 Cor. 10: 27, 28), that it is lawful for a man to eat flesh; yet if a man do remind him that it was offered to idols, it would be unlawful, because he who would eat of the same would seem to approve idolatry thereby (1 Cor. 8: 10).

## "DR. NEVIN AND THE REST OF US;"

OR

G. D. WOLFF'S ALLEGATIONS.

To relieve the drowsy character of its columns, a *new and interesting* feature has recently been introduced into the *Reformed Church Messenger*. On its first page its readers are regaled with a delightfully fresh and rich dish of "Theology and Criticism" each week. This new Department—this mental relish, is prepared by the Professors at Lancaster, and cannot fail to be as eminently palatable as the viands usually are which come from that restaurant. One of these Professors of the metaphysical and theological culinary art, as practiced at Lancaster, modestly and very appropriately informs us, that the correct and legal title of this new firm is, "*Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us.*" Of course this *new* feature of the venerable and solid *Messenger* will create quite a demand for "the beautiful *tiny* Chromo, entitled the Little Student." It is to be hoped that the supply of that exquisite work of art will not fail under the rush of new subscribers for early copies. It would be sad, indeed, if all the copies containing this new, popular and highly captivating feature, could not be supplied to new subscribers from the beginning. Outsiders who read *unauthorized* publications and do not need this new inducement to relish the fresh columns of the *Messenger*, are left to infer that here is where the tinkering, supposed needful to be done, in order to retrieve Lancaster from the damage of the attack of "*the Catholic Standard*," is to be carried on. So, then, after all the windy assertion, insulting rudeness of "Common Sense"—the gymnastics and twistings of "Inquirer," it is felt that the allegations of G. D. Wolff, charging that Nevinism as a feeder to Rome, has not been answered—that the affected indignation of the Reading Junto, with its affectation of injured innocence, does not settle the questions that are raised in the public mind; that now, after this disastrous and miserably noisy failure, resort must be had to the old feeble trick, of diverting the minds of the people from this painful situation. Now those who care to be amused and cheated, may find in these columns of "Theology and Criticism" the platitudes that have so often before mesmerized



them into a profound sleep. Here are delicious tit-bits about mechanical ideas of the church—about the Philosophy of Mercersburg—the Theology of Mercersburg—about the *churchly* spirit—about the Festivals—about Liturgical Usages, etc. This chaff has served to deceive the good and unsuspecting members of the church for years, and to divert their minds from the great issue: Reformed or Ritualistic. But its virtue is spent, and now they know it to be but chaff.

"The rest of us." Who are the perverts so styling themselves? It is not needful to ask. They are those for whom Dr. Nevin has become an oracle, and who look for a day when his mixture of Puseyism and Pantheism shall have captivated the world and become the universal faith. Were it not well, however, for "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us" not to run away from the issue of facts so plumply stated by those who charge that they are Guide-posts that point the way to Rome? Were it not well to postpone those nice recitations in theology and criticism and make a pastime by meeting the issue? No danger but that the public will enjoy it. G. D. Wolff has asserted that by the Protestant and Theological Doctors Nevin, Harbaugh, Gerhart, Higbee and Apple, the first seeds of Catholic truth were implanted in the mind of E. O. Forney, the recent pervert to Rome. This has not yet been denied by any one of these parties over his own proper name. When gentlemen are personally and by name charged, as in this case, with what is a crime in the eyes of honest men, there is no way to meet it but by a denial made in person. "Common Sense" swaggers, blusters and declares G. D. Wolff a slanderer; but that is no more than a *noise in the dark*, and that is all its real value. The man who is imagined to conduct the *Messenger*, attributes the perversion of Mr. Forney to the *fascinating* Literature of Rome. A discovery, truly. The Literature of the Romish church fascinating! Who ever heard of this before? Deus, Liguori, the lives of the Popes, of the Saints, etc., fascinating literature, together with Molinos and Escobar's 42 volumes! With a sad disregard of the *ninth* Commandment, he charges Dr. Schaff with the entire blame of having recommended this Literature that misled poor Forney. Then follow "the Rest of us" and declare that the Protestant and Theological Doctors at Mercersburg and Lancaster have produced as good and as strong arguments against Rome as Dr. Bomberger, F. W. Kremer and

the Tiffin Doctors. Is not this a reply to such a charge with an appendix? There can be no ground for comparison, no matter what the logical or theological value of these anti-Mercersburg productions may be; no one ever alleged that they had lured the young and unwary under their pupilage to Rome. They never have seemed as Guide-posts to the Vatican. It will be time to look after these Tiffin and Ursinus Doctors when it once is charged on them that they are wanting in fidelity to Protestantism and have disregarded their oaths as Professors in *Theology*. Such a reply only amounts to the paltriest subterfuge; and yet these make up the entire attempt at an answer to or denial of the *Catholic Standard's* charge. No evidence of a manly, honest and earnest desire to have the church learn the truth of this matter. What "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us" may yet bring forth under "Theology and Criticism," remains to be seen. Those who are satisfied with such treatment of a grave and far reaching question by men who dare not appear as does G. D. Wolff, over their own name, must have "*uncommon sense*" and large capacity for deglutition. It is but fair to the Church and the Truth that all the subterfuges be uncovered that are resorted to in this affair, and that the real issue as to the character of the training at Mercersburg and Lancaster be made known. That G. D. Wolff has done a service in this direction by his revelations, no one can doubt, no matter what the intention may have been. It is true it will not undo the fearful wrong already done to souls, but it may hinder others from venturing too near "the Hell of waters" that has engulfed so many. It may at last awaken the too trusting church. After this unsatisfactory and trifling disposition of this weighty matter by "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us," it is but proper that we should examine the data by which the charge is sustained. 1. The anti-Nevinites or those opposed to the *undue* prominence given in Mercersburg teaching to the efficiency of the sacraments—the priestly character of the ministry and Romish idea of the church—already 25 years ago charged just this issue of those teachings. They declared its legitimate end would be to lead to Rome. This was then scouted and ridiculed, yet Doctors Berg and Heiner, with the Classis of North Carolina, hesitated not to charge "those able and strong" arguments of Dr. Nevin, entitled Cyprian, etc., etc., as having the tendency to fit men for the Romish church. All the perversions during these years were no surprise to such Re-

formed and Protestant members of the church, for they could not mistake the seed that was sown, and it must need be that the harvest come in due time. It is a sad harvest, indeed, that our poor wronged and deluded church is reaping, of tares and of sorrow, from Dr. Nevin's husbandry, assisted by "the Rest of us."

2. What the *exoteric* teaching of Mercersburg and Lancaster is or has been, we "unauthorized" ones have no means of finding out. If those *astute* servants of the church, called "The Board of Visitors," ever heard or knew what they were, it was no part of their pleasure to inform us Rationalists or Puritans, as they are pleased to call us. We are incompetent then to judge of the tendency of those exoteric or secret views that were given the students in charge in the confidence of friendship; but as to the character of "the fascinating" *exoteric* or open teachings, we are not left in doubt. Much of this has been greatly to please Romish and high church dignitaries, and was a pure Mrs. Winslow's Syrup for "those dear little ones" who thirsted for the milk of Holy Mother, the Romish church, vide Nevin on Cyprian, Apple on Fritschel, Gerhart's Tract No. 3, etc., etc. All these were painfully adapted to lead, step by step on the way to Rome, as the Guide-post directed, and Rome has no more "fascinating Literature" than this.

3. That the obloquious epistles heaped upon Protestantism by "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us," served to destroy confidence in the early teaching of the youth committed to their charge, and to weaken the bonds that held them to the ancestral faith, is most indisputable. "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us" are skilled in the use of disparaging and damning epithets, as were the Benjaminites in the use of the sling. Perhaps never in all its history has Protestantism been so persistently and insidiously defamed and subjected to disparagement as compared with the ideal Catholic church, as by this ambitious so-called school of Theologians. This not alone in their Theology or Criticism, but in their writings intended for the uncultivated public, which is so sensitive to the sting of missiles of this kind, and for the young, who are so easily determined in their likes and dislikes by the caustic wit or defamatory sarcasm of those whom they are taught to admire. There is no question but the unveiling of the pretended weaknesses of Protestantism—the ridicule of bald Puritanism—the false charge of Rationalism on the active church of the present, has



done more to prepare the minds of the Reformed church youth for the retreat to Rome than all other agencies, and this, too, by the very men who are oath-bound to defend and teach this very Protestantism. It was not given them to create a new Protestantism or to resuscitate the old of the fourth century. Their work was to teach and defend the faith of the Heidelberg Catechism. Yet these men were daily, in books, in pamphlets, in newspapers, assailing that form of Christian faith that was bearing the gospel to the ends of the earth—was converting heathen nations to Christ—was by the salt of its presence purifying and saving the world—was exhibiting a devotion and sacrifice for the love of Christ, that has had no parallel since the apostolic age. While this was done by the weakness of Protestantism—mainly by bald Puritans and fanatics of the Methodist “sect,” “Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us” were in their snug dens at Lancaster and Mercersburg, growling, snarling, and barking their hate. While, on the other hand, so much account is made of *Catholicity*—the priestly character of ministers—so many extenuations made for Romish error and so much good discovered in that mystery of iniquity, could the result be different from what it has been? Driven from Protestantism by ridicule and unfounded assertions, it needed but little tact or aptness to have them turn to Rome *for repose and certainty—for strength and faith*. The result of this procedure is seen in the families of “Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us,” and were the *unauthorized* to do as these have done, the result would rival Lancaster in its fatality. Just here is the difference between Tiffin and Lancaster, Ursinus and Mercersburg. The former love Protestantism and have faith in its truth and its final triumph, while the latter have not. No wonder that from Mercersburg and Lancaster they go to Rome, as the Guide-posts point.

Lastly, in support of this view of the conduct of the Mercersburg and Lancaster Theological graduates, we have the direct and plain declaration of G. D. Wolff, who, we take it, speaks for himself and others. Lately he made *one* of “the Rest of us.” He leaned his head on Dr. Nevin’s bosom. He was versed in all the exoteric doctrines of the much-lauded Mercersburg Theology—he was one of its champions when assailed—he was a petted and favored confidential correspondent of the *Messenger*—he was selected to assail Tiffin. He had and yet claims to have personal friends in “Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us.” This man, whose

talents were held in great respect and whose churchliness was a boast, declares for himself, Forney and others, we may believe, who are with him in the bosom of Holy Mother, that "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us" were their Guide-posts as they traversed the perilous road that led them to Rome—and that the *Protestant* Doctors of Theology at Lancaster and Mercersburg sowed the seed in their minds that led them to embrace Romish idolatry. This is "*subjective*" testimony to a fact of which they alone can testify positively, as is done; but it is supported by the "*objective*" evidence already set forth. These parties surely are competent to know how it came to pass that they, formerly staunch Protestants, are now Romanists. Their personal veracity is beyond dispute, and "Common Sense" only degrades himself when he prefers the charge of slander. These men, too, ARE among the *elite* of the Mercersburg school, and not stupid creatures who could not comprehend the new Theology. In this case the testimony is to a conscious experimental fact in the most unequivocal terms, and is by competent witnesses of undoubted veracity, and who were and yet claim to be the personal and intimate friends of those against whom (or rather, perhaps, did we know all) for whom they testify. There are but two fair and christian modes of meeting this charge. It will not do to be silent and rely on dignity. *One* is with conscious integrity to say—ask the Protestant world—its princes of thought and chief father in Theology. What is their judgment of the certitude of our Protestantism? Here is room. "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us" have made themselves notorious—they are known to the christian world by the vauntings of their Mercersburg panacea for the ills of Protestantism. Neither Ayer's Cathartic Pills or Hembold's Buchu have had their virtues more industriously advertised. Here can be made a fair test. Come into this court of evidence. Call witnesses if you will—Protestant, Romish and unbelievers. Establish, to G. D. Wolff's confusion and the dismay of your opponents, your reputation for sound Protestantism. What do the "sects" of greatest age and character say of you? What is the voice of the Reviews and religious newspapers most ably conducted and widely circulated? Will these declare that your loyalty to Protestantism is beyond cavil? *Will this do?* No! "Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us" dare not venture into any court of evidence to prove that their honest adhesion to Protestant principles is unquestioned by those who may most or least

widely differ from them on other matters. Or, if they will, let them point to their extant writings, and challenge for them the breathings of a fervid Protestant spirit second to none in the land; point to the articles and pages where Romish error has been assailed, and her apostasy and idolatry assailed in the very spirit of the 80th Question of the Heidelberg Catechism; point to where the corruption and blasphemy of the Papacy are set forth, so that all men can see. Show the church their apologies for Protestantism—their strong and able defense of its principles—their asserted confidence in its scriptural foundation, and the certainty of its future triumphs. Brandish these recorded facts in the face of G. D. Wolff, to his shame, and then let the Christian world say who is slandered, and let not “the Rest of us” do it.

Do not say this is one of Rome’s lies, or that it is the malignant spite of “disappointed ambition” that aspired to a place among “the Rest of us.” It is yet open for the accused to say: “This is no unheard of affair; it has always been so. While Drs. Mayer and Rauch, etc., taught theology at Carlisle, York and Mercersburg, before the day of its peculiar theology, scores left their feet and went over to kiss the Pope’s toe. Why, it is so at Andover, at Princeton, at New Brunswick.” Or, why not say that the restlessness of intellect, the unsettled nature of the age, is driving young men from their ancestral moorings far out to sea with doubt; that Tiffin, Sheboygan and Ursinus have also become feeders to Rome. Failing in all this, there is no use of a resort to Billingsgate—no honesty in subterfuges that should divert the minds of the church. The only alternative left, is to tell the whole truth, shame the devil, and justify G. D. Wolff, which is his right if he has told the truth, and then vacate positions now unnaturally held.

We can conceive that it may be answered. If such be, as is alleged, the effect of the teaching at Mercersburg and Lancaster, then why not all the students be perverted by it and go to Rome, as did Wolff, Ermentrout, Wagner, &c.? We reply—1. Because the Protestantism and the piety of a few may be too sturdy to yield to the sophistry and croakings of Lancaster.

2. Because some not having the logical minds and susceptible natures of those who are named, were not forced to follow to their end and consequence the teachings they heard—whose dullness enabled them to believe, as “Dr. Nevin and the Rest of us” say, and yet remain in the Reformed church as they do.



3. Because they have not the courage to throw themselves into the arms of Holy Mother—they have reached the abyss and are Romanists at heart, but the roar of the dark flood terrifies them—they see the haven of paternal rest and peace, but they

"Linger, shivering on the brink,  
And fear to launch away."

4. Ties of kindred—the appeals of wives or those pledged to be wives—children—the fear of want, deter others. They are not ready to forsake *all*, and so the Reformed church has their names, but their hearts are over with Wolff and Forney in Rome, anticipating rest.

5. We are loath to add<sup>3</sup> this reason for the continuance with us of some, yet we are constrained to believe it from the evidence of Jesuitical teachings and morals that we see, and for what we conceive to be concealed in that appeal of G. D. Wolff in the *Standard*, addressed to his friends in the Reformed church. We fear there are those who linger with us that they may be Guide-posts to show others the way to Rome, and that their teachings may fit students and pander for that church, under advice, so as to secure it most effectually under the guide of ghostly superiors. Would that we could be assured that such is not the fact. That the allegations of G. D. Wolff are truthful, and that we are correct as to the character of the teaching at Lancaster and Mercersburg, we have the confirmatory action and results of Puseyism in the English church. Our Nevinism is only Puseyism Germanized, or Americanized, with a superadded sprinkling of Pantheism. One started from the effervescing brains of doctors shut up in Oxford, and the other at Mercersburg, by the same class of men, teaching the same Romish errors. English pulpits are filled with Romish sympathizers, who send their adherents to Rome. There is in each case the same sneaking, Jesuitical mode of action, the secret introduction of Romish rites, claims of priestly authority, arrogance, disregard of vows, vitiation of doctrine, the same denials, holding to places for stipends. Hundreds have gone to Rome from the English church; hundreds are secretly Romanists, but remain to corrupt the body of the people. So is the beginning in the Reformed church here, and God only knows where it will end.

ULRIC.

“YE SHALL KNOW THEM BY THEIR FRUITS.”

It has been a favorite mode, of late years, with many to apply the phenomena and principles of life-movements to the discussion of theological and doctrinal questions. Christianity is a life, so we are told. Life has its evolutions and developments from a first principle or germ. Christianity is organic, just as the acorn is an organism, in which is involved the living principle, which has potentially in it all the future developments of the oak tree—trunk, branches, leaves, flowers and fruits. We are not disposed at present to call in question the legitimacy of this mode of representing matters. The Scriptures use the same method, in the way of illustration, quite frequently, and there is nothing particularly new in the method, as seems to be supposed sometimes. It is obvious, however, that the method can easily be carried too far. Spiritual life, and its method of development, is of a far higher order than mere vegetable life and its unfolding, and does not follow just precisely the same law.

We all know what a favorite method this is with the new-order men. Suppose we now apply the same method to a brief contemplation of the Mercersburg movement, as it has unfolded itself in the past.

The Mercersburg movement *is a living movement; it has life.* So we were triumphantly told. It has a life which is spreading itself out far beyond the confines of our Reformed church. One enthusiastic brother felt proud in pointing to New England as becoming prevaded with the leaven of Mercersburg. Another one saw it working in the Methodist church. The Presbyterian church was feeling the impulses of this fresh, new life. “You cannot stop this thing.” It is alive, and must work out its own results, in a free way. Whoever opposes it, resisteth the Holy Spirit, and the gravest and most promising movement of the age.

Well, the movement has gone forward for a number of years. It has flourished in the house of its friends. The acorn has grown under the most assiduous nursing. We have seen arise, successively, the trunk, the branches, the leaves, the flower and the fruit. Is it a *healthy tree*, whose fruit is for the healing of the nations, whose flowers are fragrant of peace, truth and charity? Let the candid answer. It does not so seem to us. To us, look-

ing attentively at the results of the movements of the life involved in the Mercersburg scheme, the following things seem most prominent. They are so plain that we cannot see how they can be gainsayed :

1. *It has ripened some fruit.* At least seven ministers of the Reformed church, men who were most fully penetrated by the power of the Mercersburg movement, have gone over to Rome. Sons of respected ministers, as some of them were, they could not stand on Mercersburg ground without yielding to the entire claims of the Pope. True, it is asserted that the result was not a legitimate fruit of that system. We are told that not from *the principle* of the system was this fruit evolved, but from some other outside source. One man even gravely asserts, that it was simply because Mercersburg was opposed and not left to have its own way, that these conversions took place. The tree was all fair and goodly, and perfectly sound ; its fruit only turned sour and bitter because some refused to eat it. Meanwhile, all candid men must remember the words of the Lord, "Ye shall know them by their fruits."

2. *It has grown and developed some branches.* To the eyes of some, these branches may seem fine and healthy and creditable to our Reformed church. Somehow or other we cannot so regard them. We see prominent men wavering and trembling, like branches in a storm, blown hither and thither by the wind, now setting up theory after theory, now silently dropping these again in favor of others, one day approaching to the very verge of that Romanistic sacramental system which our fathers had abandoned, then jumping over into the meshes of that high-church Lutheranism which they also abhorred, now explaining away the very plainest and most fundamental teachings of our Heidelberg Catechism, then asking with seeming astonishment whether they shall not be allowed to seek a haven of rest, when Protestantism is proving itself a failure. Such a development of the life which lies embodied in the Mercersburg main branches is not very assuring.

It seems to be supposed by some, that the better way would be *not to oppose this movement* (because that gives rise to controversy), not to sound a word of alarm (because you *cannot* stop a life-evolution.) The most that ought to be done (and this seems to have been the idea of Dr. Fisher), would be to join the movement, and



try so to guide and control it, that it will do as little injury as possible. But if a tree has a bad life in it, can you improve its fruit by nursing and cherishing it? Will any amount of careful training make the *bitter* tree bring forth *sweet* fruit? Could it possibly have been a blessing to the church if we all had joined in the movement, and with it had gone so far Romeward as to have kept Dering Wolff and Forney from actually going over, by finding in us all that their Mercersburg system asked for? It seems to me that no sensible person can seriously think so.

Judged, then, by its latest fruit, by its whole development and results the Mercersburg movement must be adjudged a bad life. Whatever of specific life it has, must be defective in its very principle. We call to mind the words of our Lord: "*Beware of false prophets. . . . Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles.*"—Matt. 7: 15, 16.

ONE WHO LOVES THE OLD BETTER THAN THE NEW.

---

#### THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

THAT the *Evangelical Alliance*, recently convened in New York, has made the year 1873 memorable in the annals of Protestant Christianity, seems to be admitted by all observers of current events competent to estimate their significance. No assemblage of Christian men or of scholars ever attracted more attention; indeed, few ever attracted equal attention. None ever gave such general satisfaction, or commanded the intelligent and cordial respect of so many Christians, and persons interested in true Christianity. Not only the eye of Christendom, but one might say of the world, was fixed upon it. Although it met during a fearful financial crisis, and in the midst of the storm, tens of thousands stopped to contemplate it, and seemed to forget the storm under the shelter of its benign influence.

In every aspect the Alliance was a great success. It more than realized the highest expectations of its friends. Even some who had sneered at it in advance, or had spoken disparagingly of its prospective deliberations and its aims, felt constrained to do it homage; if not by their admiration, yet by their manifest amaze-

ment and chagrin, when they came and saw its imposing outward proportions, and felt its moral power.

Religious and secular papers all over the land so generally noticed the meeting, and so accurately reported its doings so far as concerned mere external facts, that we take it for granted that our readers have all needful information in this respect. They know that the Alliance met for its *sixth* conference in the city of New York, on Thursday evening, October 2, and was formally organized the next morning in Association Hall, (belonging to the Young Men's Christian Association of New York), at the corner of 23d Street and 4th Avenue, by the election of the venerable Rev. Dr. Woolsey, formerly President of Yale College, as President; that it was composed of 200 Foreign and 500 American delegates, besides a large number of members; that from the first its sessions were so thronged as to make it necessary to divide into sections, which met in several churches adjacent to Association Hall, each of which was crowded as much as the Hall itself, so that the actual attendance at the same time amounted in the aggregate to 10,000 persons; they know that a series of essays and addresses, prepared with great care by European and American theologians and Christian statesmen, whose learning and piety place them in the front rank of evangelical Christendom, and make them in the truest sense representative men, on various momentous subjects of a vital and fundamental character, were read and delivered, during twelve successive days, and that the liveliest interest was taken in them to the last; and, finally, they also learned through their papers, that the most perfect, cordial harmony prevailed in the Alliance from its opening to its close, with but a single slight and insignificant exception, which we will notice below.

Instead, therefore, of repeating a detailed statement of such mere external facts, we shall attempt to give our readers what may be called an inner view of the Alliance, from our own point of observation, and draw such lessons from the occasion as have suggested themselves to our mind.

*First*, the real constitution and character of the Alliance claim notice. And they do this the more because attempts have been made to disparage it for its lack of any *formal* ecclesiastical organization and *formal* ecclesiastical authority.

The Evangelical Alliance is, indeed, a free voluntary association of Christians, and frankly avows itself as much. It is *not*, and

does not pretend to be a *Church*, in the technical sense of that term, as the several denominations are churches. Hence, it does not assume the duties, offices, or work (the functions and prerogatives) of a church in that sense. The meeting in New York was, therefore, not a Synod, or General Assembly, or Council, in the usual, technical acceptance of those terms, and claimed no such formal jurisdiction over any portion of the Christian church as is exercised by ecclesiastical Synods or Councils, or General Assemblies.

But whatever it lacked in regard to *formal* functions and *formal* authority, it possessed all that essentially or in principle belongs to such authority and functions in fact. For all practical purposes and effects it was an *œcumenical* Council of entire Evangelical Christendom. A larger and more potent measure of *real* moral authority and influence invested it, than can be claimed for any formal church Council or Convention of modern times. Although its deliverances, through the leading papers, essays and disquisitions read and delivered by members appointed for the purpose, did not assume the *form* of decrees, canons, or decisions, they were made such in fact by the unanimously expressed approval and endorsement of them, and will be more generally, cordially and intelligently received as such, throughout evangelical Christendom, than has been the case with the decrees and decisions of ecclesiastical organizations speaking through Councils or Synods technically constituted such.

This would hardly be the place to enter into an argument for the claims of the Alliance in this respect, in distinction from those of what are usually styled and regarded as regularly constituted ecclesiastical judicatories or Synods. We have, therefore, laid aside for the present, some views upon this point which very naturally suggested themselves in this connection. But we believe that it could easily be shown that such manifestations of the Christian life and faith as the Alliance exhibits, are as legitimate and, in the truest sense, as organic developments or outgrowths of a living Christianity, as any formal church organizations, with their formal functions and authority. We might even go further, and maintain that the Alliance is the legitimate offspring of the inmost life of the best church organizations produced by the reformed, regenerated Christianity of modern times.

This was deeply felt by all who attended its sessions in New



York, with any true appreciation of the great principles which it represented. As they listened to its voice, speaking through such men as Dorner and Christlieb, Fischer, Conlin and Krummacher, Arnot, Smith (the Dean of Canterbury), and Harrison, Hodge, Hitchcock and Fisher (of Yale), all must have inwardly said: This is speaking with authority (such as pertains to the power of truth), and not as the Scribes.

With such a spiritual and moral constitution and character, it may well be believed that the real authority and influence of the Alliance will prove that it represents a Christian unity and union more mighty and far-reaching than any so-called organic (that is, formally and mechanically organic) union ever possessed or exerted by any church.

Possibly there may have been in the Alliance one or another individual who, at heart, was not in harmony with its evangelical principles and purposes, and who would consequently not endorse its utterances and unequivocally Protestant standpoint. If this was the case, it is not for us to explain the incongruity of their presence or participation in such a conference. And it is unnecessary to do so, as no one openly betrayed such disagreement, and as no such possible exception could invalidate the claims, vitiate the character, or neutralize the power of the Alliance itself.

In the *second* place, the ecclesiastical, doctrinal and theological position maintained by the Alliance, and reasserted at its recent meeting, entitles it to more interested consideration than even its constitution and character. Here was room for the expression of diversity of sentiment, if any such diversity existed. The subjects discussed were in most cases vital and fundamental. Disagreement in regard to them would prove that the seeming union or unity was but superficial and deceptive—a wretched, heartless sham. Agreement in regard to them would demonstrate a measure of real, solid unity, of which no existing church organization, and, least of all, that of the late Popish Vatican Council, can boast.

Now, such agreement was most clearly and impressively displayed. The only topic concerning which some difference of sentiment manifested itself, was that touching State churches, and the question of disestablishment, now agitating England, and, to some extent, Prussia. But even here the diversity was slight,

and affected no principle involved, but only a matter of policy, as to the best way of rectifying what all admitted to be an evil.

Upon all other points the most cordial unanimity prevailed. As with one heart and mind the Alliance clearly and unambiguously reaffirmed the vital principles and fundamental doctrines of Evangelical Protestantism, against the various forms and manifestations of modern infidelity on the one hand, as well as against Popery in its full *folio* form at Rome, or in its "*duodecimo*" (as Dorner called them) issues from Oxford and elsewhere.

In these respects the leading papers read at the Alliance, especially those of the distinguished German delegates, were intensely to our mind; and little as we fancied the vocal and "palmy" demonstrations with which the immense audiences, unable to suppress their emotions, greeted them, it was difficult at times to refrain from joining in with the approving applause.

Our limited space will of course not allow us to give many extracts from the essays read, or addresses delivered. Our readers must therefore be content with the following two or three.

First, we select one from Dr. Dorner's able and searching paper on *Papal Infallibility* and *Nominal Protestantism*. After having dissected the former with the hand of a skillful surgeon, and exposed its rottenness, he proceeds to expose the errors and evils of what he condemns as a Protestantism which, whilst it clings to the name, is really little, if any, better than Popery in disguise. And this is his judgment regarding it:

"Alarmed by the abuse of freedom, on the one side, others flee from freedom altogether. Lest they should open the door to disorganizing arbitrariness, they imprison Christianity itself; lest they should give room to subjectivism, they lead the way to an objectivism which is human bondage. Church authority is made the basis of faith; the symbols of the church, and their formula, are placed above the Bible; church tradition is most scrupulously guarded, not because it is the truth, but because it is tradition, and thus there is a zeal for evangelical doctrines which are based merely on tradition. Many, who are especially anxious for the credit of orthodoxy, subordinate the study of the Scriptures to the symbolical books and the ancient dogmatical writers. They are annoyed when the believer in the study of the Scriptures shows the necessity of harmonizing more completely church doctrine with the Bible. They are sluggish in the fulfillment of the

duty of the true scribe, in bringing out of the treasure of the heart things new and old. (Matt. 13: 52). There is a tendency, still more extended, to substitute for the ancient, conscious, personal form of piety, an impersonal form, which lives in shadowy and æsthetic feelings of an indefinite kind. This they accomplish by means of gorgeous ceremonial and manifold symbolism; by subordinating the preaching of the Word to the Liturgy and the Sacrament; by the propagation of Christianity rather by cramming the mind with Christian material than by leading to Christian knowledge and the personal appreciation of the truth of salvation; by sensuous forms and ceremonials, to which spiritual indolence ascribes the power of pervading the entire man, as a fluid, with magical influence. And connected with this there is likewise an unevangelical emphasis of the power of the keys, and a Romanizing distinction between the clergy and laity, which is rooted in the unevangelical doctrine of sacramental ordination. This method, which is a reaction from evangelical Christianity, is unfruitful in religion, is unsuited to the needs of the present age, and to the ever-youthful Gospel and to its regenerative powers. It is related to the present as a peevish old man who would carefully guard a rich inheritance, yet allows it to rust and spoil, because he does not increase it by use, and does not continually coin and distribute the noble metal of the Gospel. The church will never in this way prevail over the masses of the people who are estranged from it. Rather this leaven of Romanism, which has again been brought in, leads back behind the Reformation of which it speaks with unhappy retractions and regrets, while it takes away or shakes the evangelical assurance of faith, destroys the present evangelical unity, misleads, if not to apostasy to Rome, yet to weak effort to establish on evangelical soil, a kind of duodecimo Popedom in every congregation. But we cannot linger longer by this foul stream, which now flows through the evangelical church of more than one land. It has already been condemned by what has been said with reference to the modern Romish church, of which it is but a dwarfish, inconsistent copy."

Declarations like these leave no room to doubt either where the learned author or the Alliance stands in regard to the controversy which has been so unhappily disturbing our own church for some years past. Manifestly, Dr. Dorner has not changed his mind since



1868; and others besides ourselves, who heard him at the Alliance, must have felt so too.

The following extracts from Dr. Christlieb's paper, on the *best method of contending against modern infidelity*, will be found in full accordance with the preceding sentiments of Dr. Dorner:

"A thoroughly wrong method—one which is diametrically opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, and has not, sad to say, always been used by the Roman church only—is the supposition of opposition against certain dogmas by physical force, or by merely appealing to the outward authority of the church. In the same way we reject—and I think you will agree with me in this—as unevangelical, unfruitful, and productive of confusion, the cognate tendency shown by the extreme ecclesiastical party in the Protestant church to oppose the unbridled independence and subjective arbitrariness of the criticism of our day, by an overstrained assertion of the rights of the priestly office, and who would endeavor to raise a barrier against the prevalence of free investigation and spontaneous appropriation of truth, by laying an exaggerated stress upon the sacramental actions of the church, which the most advanced of them are already beginning to make into sacrificial rites. These theories and tendencies we reject, for a knowledge or appropriation of saving grace communicated otherwise than by moral (not magical) means, is opposed no less to Scripture than to the spirit of our age.

The trust that sustains us in this tremendous struggle, waged not with men alone, but with all the powers of darkness, must not be founded on ourselves, nor on other weak men; not on any outward assistance from the State, nor on forms and ceremonies (for 'cursed is the man that maketh flesh his arm,' Jer. 17: 5), but on the Lord Himself, who sits exalted at his Father's right hand, as Ruler over all, even the raging of His enemies. His presence is not bound to outward forms or traditions; He is the Spirit (2 Cor. 3: 17), and from Him proceeds the spirit of truth. To this, His spirit, we must in the last resort leave the work of convincing men's hearts and minds of the truth of Christian revelation, without sparing them the trouble of free investigation, or of a conscientious decision and self-resolve. In accordance with these principles our human task in the battle against unbelief can be no other than to overcome the opponent by moral and spiritual means. First of all, that is, by an earnest, spiritually-

vigorous testimony for Christ; next, by a truly scientific delineation of Christian belief, as a view of the world and of God, which is strictly coherent and corroborated by history and conscience, while at the same time open, acknowledging all its difficulties and obscurities; and last, by a practical demonstration of its truth in Christian living and suffering."

For the present these specimens must suffice. Perhaps we may hereafter find room for further and fuller extracts from these and other important papers presented.

In conclusion, we will only add that, for the service rendered to the cause of evangelical Christianity, all who love the Lord and His Gospel have great reason for gratitude and joy. The great convocation has adjourned. Its members who came from afar, in obedience to the call of duty, and under the promptings of devotion to the cause of Christ, are on their homeward voyage. May He who rules the waves of the sea grant them a safe return. They have cheered our hearts, and strengthened our hands, by joining their noble testimony with that of faithful defenders of the Gospel in our own land. The Lord reward them for the blessed service.

But though the assembly has broken up, and its members have returned to their several fields of labor, the benign influence of the Alliance will be permanently felt, and secure to our holy cause enduringly blessed results.

---

#### REGENERATION BY BAPTISM.

*(Concluding Article.)*

##### EXAMINATION OF ALLEGED PROOFS FROM REFORMED AUTHORITIES.

LET it be remembered, that the Lancaster-Mercersburg doctrine on this subject is: 1, *that regeneration is a conveyance, by emanation, of a portion of the substance of God, into the centre of man's soul;* 2, *that Baptism is the channel through which that substance is so conveyed;* and 3, *that this substance is the actual, literal, substantial germ of the new life in the regenerate.*

The first point in this remarkable, unscriptural and anti-Re-

formed theory, as represented and advocated by Mr. Rupp, was soon dropped by him, as has already been shown. He made but a slight attempt to press it, and found it so impossible to support it either by the Word of God, or proof from church authorities, that it was quietly ignored. And yet the argument fairly requires either that he shall manfully defend it, or manfully confess that he erred in advancing it. The former cannot be done on any sufficient grounds. And it would involve an awkward surrender of the fundamental principle of the peculiar theology of his school to do the other.

But having virtually abandoned this first point, attempts have been made, with all the more vigor, to support the doctrine implied in the second, viz: that regeneration, whatever it may be, is effected through Baptism; that is, the outward formal sacrament of Baptism.

This it was attempted to prove by Scripture, by the testimony of the early church fathers, and lastly by testimony of the Reformed standards. We have followed, and refuted these attempted proofs of the false doctrine (excepting those cited from the early church fathers of the third and fourth centuries, which are considered of comparatively smaller significance), down to the point where certain quotations are cited which are claimed as incontrovertible evidence that our Reformed fathers held and taught the doctrine in question.

These quotations, therefore, remain to be considered. They are entitled to calm and fair consideration, all the more because they are so often forced into the service of an error which the Reformed church has plainly repudiated, and which standard Reformed authors have uniformly rejected and denounced.

But before proceeding to our task, may it not be well to remind ourselves of a few simple rules of interpretation, by which the teachings of all books, confessions, and authors must be explained, and which should especially be applied with candor, to any declarations or statements which may possibly be taken in two or more senses? To insist upon this, implies no evasion at all, but is only demanding what common honesty requires, and what it would be very dishonest to refuse.

One of these rules is, that every book and writer should be understood and explained in accordance with their distinctly announced general principles and fundamental doctrines.



Another rule is, that no reasonable author and book will palpably contradict themselves, at least not upon any material or essential point.

A third is, that any technical terms or phrases in older writings must be understood in the sense in which they were commonly employed at that time, and by the class of writers who make use of them.

And finally, to name no other, it is an admitted rule, that any doubtful or ambiguous passages in such writings should be taken and explained in harmony with such as are not doubtful or ambiguous.

Now, as our respected representative of the New-order theology in the present case, has frankly avowed his desire to be truly Reformed in his views, it may be taken for granted that he will cheerfully acknowledge the justice and propriety of applying the above fair and simple rules to the matter in hand.

The first quotation to be noticed is from Ursinus, as follows :

"There are two things to be considered in all sacraments: *the signs*, which are visible, earthly and corporeal; these are the rites and ceremonies—the things which are visible and corporeal, which God exhibits to us by the minister, and which we receive corporeally, that is, by the members and senses of the body. Then we have *the things signified*, which are invisible, heavenly and spiritual, which include Christ Himself and all His benefits, which are communicated unto us of God by faith spiritually, that is, by the virtue and power of the Holy Spirit.

"The union between the signs and the things signified is not natural or local, but relative, by the appointment of God, by which things invisible and spiritual *are represented* by those that are visible and corporeal, *as by visible words*, and *are exhibited and received in connection with the signs* in their lawful use.

"The things signified, are always received in connection with the signs in the lawful use of the sacraments. The signs are, therefore, not by any means empty or insignificant, notwithstanding the *things are received in one way, and the signs in another.*"—Williard's Ursinus, pp. 354-55.

By these passages, therefore, it is assumed that Ursinus taught the doctrine of Lancaster, touching *regeneration* by baptism. Let them be carefully examined, to ascertain whether they do so teach.

What does Ursinus mean when he says that "the things signified by the signs are received in connection with the signs?" Mr. R. and his school assume that he teaches, that in and through baptism something substantial (we will not here press their notion that this substance is a portion of the substance of God) is conveyed over to the person baptized, which becomes the substantial

germ of the new, regenerated life ; or they maintain that Ursinus at least teaches that baptism is God's appointed instrument and means of effecting regeneration.

We deny that Ursinus teaches any such doctrine, and deny it on the following grounds :

1. The *terms and statements* of the passages quoted and appealed to, do not require the sense in which the advocates of regeneration by baptism take them.

Of course the passages selected are the strongest which could be found for the purpose. They are among those in which our Reformed standards and early theologians declare their positive faith in the divine ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, as actual and effective means of grace, under the Holy Spirit, against those who held that they were mere outward ceremonies, without *any* objective virtue.

Now, Ursinus says, as above quoted, that the *union* between the sacramental signs and the things signified by them, is such that the things signified by them are received along with the signs, when these latter are properly dispensed and received.

*But what*, according to Ursinus and all our Reformed standards and standard authors, *are the things signified* in this case ? *What are the contents, so to speak, of these ordinances ?* Are they the regenerating and saving benefits of salvation *in the first instance*, or *as now first conveyed and communicated* ? The Theological Faculty at Lancaster says *yes*, and appeals to such declarations of Ursinus, &c., as those above quoted.

But even those declarations will not sustain the Faculty in this view. The signs do indeed point to Christ and His benefits, signify, and, under a visible form, exhibit them to the eye of faith ; nay, they *offer* them to the true recipient. They do this, however, under the Spirit, *only in accordance with their proper nature and divinely fixed purpose and limitations*. And this is all that the passages before us teach. In them, as in all similar declarations, Ursinus teaches that baptism and the Lord's Supper are "not mere empty or insignificant signs," but that they really serve the purpose for which they were instituted, viz.: to communicate the blessings they are appointed to communicate to those for whose benefit they are designed.

This we, too, hold, and have ever held, most heartily and firmly. The ordinances referred to have been mercifully provided

and appointed by God for the bestowal of great blessings ; and all the great blessings they are appointed to bestow, may be fully realized by all who use them in accordance with the purpose and command of the Lord. The things signified by them are really united with them, in the fullest sense intended and fixed by Him who instituted them ; and the fact of such union will be demonstrated in the happy experience of every one who rightly and sincerely uses them.

Here, however, the respected Faculty at Lancaster falls into grave mistake. Planting its feet upon these premises, they make a great leap to most unwarranted inferences and conclusions. They force their thoughts into the words of Ursinus, and construe his statements into a doctrine which they do not teach.

For, it must be evident to every one candidly studying the passages quoted, that they *do not* teach that the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper are *the* divinely appointed means for the *first begetting* of the new life in the soul—for the *primary conveyance* of renewing and saving grace. And in so suddenly assuming that Ursinus and others teach this in such passages, the party in question not only wrongs Ursinus and the standards of our church, but betrays an over-hasty eagerness to support its erroneous doctrine by a constrained interpretation of those standards. In this the Faculty furnishes another illustration of the blinding power and perverting influence of a false philosophical (or seemingly philosophical) theory over the reason, judgment and heart of those who are captivated by such a theory. Much as the unhappy effect of such a mistake may be deplored, even the official authority of the party making it should not, and cannot, prevail upon us to accept of their hurtful error.

2. In the next place we deny that Ursinus teaches what is claimed in the above passages, *because he most clearly and explicitly teaches and declares the very opposite of the doctrine ascribed to him, in numerous other passages, and by the whole tenor of his doctrine concerning the sacraments and regeneration.*

In proof of this, it might suffice to refer to what has been shown in our articles on the subject, published in September (on Regeneration) and October. A few more declarations may, however, be quoted in corroboration of those there cited.

Upon the relative efficacy of the Word and the Sacraments, as means of grace, Ursinus says :



"The Holy Ghost *works faith* in our hearts by the preaching of the Gospel, and *cherishes, confirms and seals* it by the use of the Sacraments. The Word is a charter, to which the *Sacraments are attached as signs*. The charter is the Gospel to which the *Sacraments are affixed as the seals* of the divine will. Whatever the Word promises, concerning our salvation, that the Sacraments, as *signs and seals annexed* thereto, *confirm* unto us *more and more*, for the purpose of *helping our infirmity*." (Commentary, p. 340).

"The Sacraments are used lawfully, when the faithful, or *such as are converted* (that is, according to Ursinus and early Reformed theologians, *regenerated*), observe the rites which God has instituted, as *signs of grace*, and *pledges* of His will to them." (P. 350).

"The Word is preached to the unregenerated, that they may be *regenerated*, and exercise faith in Christ, or be rendered wholly inexcusable; and to the regenerate, that their faith may be more and more confirmed. The Sacraments, on the other hand, are dispensed *only to those who are members of the church* (that is, according to Ursinus, to those presumed to be regenerated), who profess repentance and faith, and *are designed to preserve* and strengthen their faith." (P. 352).

"The Word may be without the Sacraments, as it respects both its public and private exposition; and *it may be effectual, also, independent of the Sacraments*, as in the case of Cornelius. The Sacraments, on the other hand, *cannot be without the Word—nor can they have any efficacy independent of it*." (P. 353).

"Faith is called into exercise and confirmed by the Word; the Sacraments *do nothing more than confirm faith*." (P. 353).

More particularly defining the office and ends of baptism, Ursinus makes such declarations as the following:

"The *chief end of Baptism is the confirmation of our faith*, or a solemn declaration by which Christ testifies that He washes us with His blood and Spirit, and confers upon us remission of sins, and the Holy Ghost who regenerates and sanctifies us unto eternal life. Or it is a *sealing of the promise* of grace, that is of our justification and regeneration, and a *declaration of the will of God*, that He here grants these gifts, to those who are baptized, and that He will forever grant them." (P. 538).

"The right use of Baptism consists in administering it to

those for whom it was instituted, that is *those who are converted* and members of the church." (P. 363).

"Christ designs to *confirm us* by this sign. Hence, He adds, 'and is baptized,' that *we may know* by this external washing with water, as well as by our faith, that we are of the number of those who shall be saved." (Pp. 363-4).

"All, and only those who are renewed (that is regenerated) or being renewed, receive baptism lawfully, being baptized for those ends for which Christ instituted this Sacrament." (Pp. 373-4).

"The Holy Spirit, by His substance or virtue is not any more in this water (of baptism) than elsewhere; but He works in the hearts of those who are baptized, in the lawful use of baptism, and sprinkles and washes them spiritually by the blood of Christ, *whilst He uses this external symbol as a means and as a visible word or promise to stir up and confirm the faith of those who are baptized.*" (P. 372).

These quotations will doubtless suffice. And yet they are as our friends who advocate regeneration by baptism, must, or ought to know, only a small part of the evidence which Ursinus furnishes, that he did not hold or teach their view of the subject. His entire doctrine of the Sacrament is against their theory and speculations, as was clearly shown in the September and October articles. And the irreconcilable difference between his views and theirs, would appear in an almost ludicrous light by placing the two beside each other in parallel columns. We have not space to do this, but let some of our readers try it.

Now this doctrine of the Catechism is most consistently maintained, and without the least material variation, by all subsequent Reformed Confessions and theologians.

The next proof-quotations relied upon by Mr. Rupp, is taken from the

*Earlier Helvetic Confession,*

also called the second Basle Confession. In Mr. R's article it is given as follows :

"Baptism is a sacrament wherein the Lord, by a visible sign, doth testify His grace unto us; *whereby He doth regenerate us, and cleanse us from our sins,* and also receive us to be His people, that we may live to Christ, die to the old Adam, and be partakers of the good things of Christ.

"Therefore, just as we do, and always did receive these sentences of Scripture touching the ministry of the Word, namely: The minister doth convert, remit sins, open the eyes and hearts of men, give faith and the Spirit: so, being well

understood, we do acknowledge also these sentences touching the Sacraments, namely: *The minister, through baptism, doth regenerate, and wash away sins; he doth distribute and present the body and blood of the Lord.*"—Declaration of Former Helvetic Confession, a. 1757.

Although we have examined the said Confession (Niemeyer's edition) in vain for these quotations, both in the Latin and Swiss versions (the latter being fuller than the former), we are willing to let the party for which Mr. R. speaks, have the benefit of his own rendering of the original.\*

In the first part of the passage cited, nothing can be found to favor the error advocated by the party, for it simply asserts that baptism *is a sign of the grace* by which God regenerates, and cleanses us from our sins. That no other power or virtue is ascribed to baptism than Ursinus taught, is evident from the previous definition of faith in articles 13 and 14.

In the second part of the passage cited Mr. R. has very seriously missed the sense of any credible version he may have had before him. For, when he makes the Helvetic Confession say, without any qualification, that "the minister doth convert, remit sins, open the eyes and hearts of men, *give faith*, and the Spirit," every intelligent reader will feel and say at once, here some one has sadly blundered, either Mr. R., or the printer.

The most that our version affirms (see below) is, that the minister is a co-worker with God in the sense sent forth by Paul in 1 Cor. 3: 9, &c., (see also 2 Cor. 6: 1). That Paul was *infinitely* far from meaning what Mr. R. makes our Helvetic fathers here teach, may be easily seen by turning to the chapter referred to. Those fathers were not such papists, or even worse, and to teach that the minister could *give faith* and *the Holy Spirit* to men, and as little that he could regenerate them by baptism.

What the version which Mr. R. had before him *may* possibly

---

\*The Latin text in Niemeyer is:

*De ministeris verbis:* Atque haec ob causam ministros ecclesiae *co-operarios esse dei* (quod Paulus agnoscit, 1 Cor. 3) fatemur per quos *ille* et cognitionem sui, et peccatorum remissionem administrat, homines ad se convertat, erigat, consoletur, terreat etiam et judicet. *Ita tamen*, ut virtutem et efficaciam in his omnem domino ministerium ministris tamen *adscribamus*. Nam haec virtutem efficaciamque nulli omnino creaturae alligari, sed libera dei dignatione dispensari iis quibus ipse velit, certum est.

*Baptisma*, quidem ex institutione domini lavacri regenerationis quam dominus *electis suis* *visibili signo* per ecclesiae ministerium, (qualiter supra expositum est) *exhibeat*.

Then follows a declaration concerning the baptism of infants which Mr. R. overlooked; or, he may have had some other version of the confession before him, which, for additional reasons, seems probable.



have affirmed, must be this, that in the same Scriptural sense in which we accept and hold those texts of Scripture touching the office of the minister, which teach that God makes use of him as an instrument or means, in the conversion of men, &c., by their preaching of the Gospel, &c., in the same sense, (and in no other) do we hold that baptism is the means of signifying and sealing, unto those who believe or are in the covenant (as children of believers are), their regeneration.

This explanation is fully confirmed by what is taught concerning baptism in the *Second Helvetic Confession*. (See Monthly for June, 1873).

Mr. Rupp next quotes from

*Calvin's Catechism of 1538,*

as follows: :

"Do you then ascribe nothing more to the water than only this, that it is a figure of washing?"

"I regard it is a figure with which the truth is at the same time conjoined. For God in promising to us His gifts, does not deceive us. Hence it is certain that both the pardon of sins and the new life are offered to us, and received by us in baptism." *Calvin's Catechism, a. 1538.*

Next we have a quotation from the

*Confession of Scotland of 1560.*

"We totally condemn those who affirm, that the sacraments are nothing more than mere naked signs. But, on the contrary, we believe certainly that, *through baptism, we are ingrafted into Jesus Christ*, and are made partakers of His righteousness through which all our sins are covered and remitted." *Confession of Scotland, a. 1560.*

"Lastly, one from the

*Gallican Confession of 1559.*

"We acknowledge that there are only two sacraments common to the whole church. Whereof, the first is baptism: that which is given us to testify our adoption; because that *therein we are ingrafted into Christ's body*, that, being washed in His blood, we may also be renewed to holiness of life by His Spirit." *Gallican Confession, a. 1559.*

Each of these, as will be readily admitted, must be taken in a sense harmonizing with the general doctrine concerning the sacraments, as held and avowed by their authors. And thus taken, they furnish no support to the error of the Lancaster-Mercersburg school. Having sufficiently proven this in the case of Ursinus

(whose views as set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism and in his Commentary, all the Reformed churches represented by these Confessions unanimously and cordially accepted, as being one acquainted with the facts in the case knows), we need not go over the ground again.

With this, then, we dismiss the case. If anything can ever be demonstrated, it must be evident that in teaching what Mr. Rupp has taught, and what the Theological Faculty at Lancaster has endorsed, concerning regeneration, and baptism as *the* instrument of effecting it, is unwarranted by the Scriptures, and contrary to the faith of the entire Reformed church.

Our discussion of the subject has been necessarily extended through several issues of the *Monthly*. It must be remembered, however, that we were reviewing a lengthy article in the *Mercersburg Review*, and five long articles in defence of it in another publication. And we are glad to have learned that what we have written has been well received and has proven satisfactory and profitable to many brethren.

No reply to our criticism will be answered by us, unless it honestly takes up the whole doctrine advanced by Mr. Rupp, and attempts to vindicate that doctrine.

---

#### GIVING.

##### HOW SHOULD I GIVE?

1. I ought to "give as God hath prospered"—that is in proportion to the means placed in my hand. The widow with her two mites, is not relieved from the obligation, and the rich are called upon to give according to their abundance.

2. I should give liberally—not in stinted measure.

3. I ought to give cheerfully, not grudgingly.

4. My gifts should be the result of principle—not one of mere whim, or under the influence of exciting appeals. I should inform myself in respect to proper objects, and purpose in my heart to give.

5. I ought to give frequently. This is God's plan: "On the

first of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered."

WHY SHOULD I GIVE?

1. It is God's will. He has commanded it just as he has commanded repentance, faith and baptism.
2. Because God is always giving to me.
3. God has attached large promises to giving. I must not forget this.
4. Giving will be promotive of my own happiness.
5. The subjects of necessity are numerous.
6. The opportunity of giving will soon pass away.
7. These gifts will be remembered in the judgment. How unspeakably desirable is Christ's approval.
8. Have I not been remiss in times past?
9. Gratitude for the unspeakable gift of God's dear Son ought to move me to give.—*Christian Observer.*

EMPHASIS.

SOME years ago there was a student at the theological seminary at Andover, who had an excellent opinion of his own talents. On one occasion he asked the professor who taught elocution at the time, "What do I especially need to learn in this department?" "You ought first to learn to read," said the professor. "O, I can read now," replied the student. The professor handed the young man a Testament, and pointed to the 25th verse of the 24th chapter of Luke's Gospel; he asked him to read that. The student read: "Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." "Ah," said the professor, "they were fools for believing the prophets, were they?" "Of course that was not right, and so the young man tried again: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe *all* that the prophets have spoken."



"The prophets, then, were sometimes liars?" asked the professor.

No. "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the *prophets* have spoken."

"According to this reading," the professor suggested, "the prophets were notorious liars."

This was not a satisfactory conclusion, and so another trial was made: "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have *spoken*."

"I see now," said the professor; "the prophets wrote the truth, but they spoke lies."

This last criticism discouraged the student, and he acknowledged that he did not know how to read. The difficulty lies in the fact that the words "of heart to believe" applies to the whole of the latter part of the sentence, and emphasis on any particular word entirely destroys the meaning.

---

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

### OUR LITERARY SOCIETIES.

OF the importance, and even necessity, of literary associations in colleges and other educational institutions, it would be superfluous to write. Long experience has abundantly demonstrated their value. When founded, as they commonly are, upon a right basis, conducted according to proper rules, and kept within their legitimate limits, they afford the very opportunities which students intent upon their improvement need for reducing to practice the lessons they have learned in their several departments, and for acquiring skill in the use of the treasures of knowledge they may amass.

In such societies students learn much, therefore, which could not be learned in the ordinary course of school work. And not the least of the advantages thus secured, is that of ease and free-

dom of manner and action, combined with the discipline of orderly action when called to some public duty.

Every student should be a member of such a society. Membership adds but little per term to his school expenses; and for that little he will get ample returns. The duties of membership will not interfere with his regular work, but rather afford the earnest and spirited student profitable incitement and pleasing variety.

Each member, also, should promptly and zealously perform the duties assigned to him, and promptly do all in his power to serve and promote the interests of the association. There should be no slothful shrinking from work—no shirking of tasks assigned in turn, by paying fines rather than perform them. No payment of fines can compensate the society for the service thus lost. The society may need money, but it has far greater need of constantly improving mind.

It is gratifying to state, that the two societies of Ursinus College, the *Zwinglian* and the *Schaff*, are in a flourishing condition. Both are organized upon sound and approved principles, and are prosecuting their work with commendable energy. Neither is secret, in the least objectionable sense, and they are zealously pursuing legitimate literary, moral and social aims. The former has recently changed its place of meeting from the room formerly occupied in the west wing of the college, to a more suitable one in the new building (east wing), which has been comfortably fitted up for the purpose. The latter society continue in their commodious room in the upper story of the same building. A kindly, earnest rivalry inspires both.

And now, to come to the main point of this notice, we desire to commend both these societies to the liberal consideration of all our friends. They need funds to keep their libraries supplied, and for other purposes. They should be encouraged in their youthful efforts, by being furnished with what they thus need. It is not so long since we ourselves occupied a position similar to theirs, but that we can well remember the cheering effect of even small donations from those whose hearts prompted them to encourage young men engaged in literary pursuits. And without consulting our students in regard to the matter, we feel safe in pledging their grateful appreciation of like favors.

Let our friends, therefore, stimulate our young men to increased

ardor in the prosecution of their studies, by giving them needful substantial proofs of good will and sympathy. In this way two benefits will be conferred. It will directly help and cheer the societies, and indirectly it will promote the interests of the college with which they are connected.

#### CATAWBA COLLEGE, N. C.

DOUBTLESS to the readers of our church periodicals, it has often been a matter of surprise that Catawba college, retaining as she does her place in our almanacs among the literary institutions of the Reformed church, so seldom feels herself called upon to give an account of her stewardship. We propose in a brief article to consider her present condition and prospects, leaving the more difficult task of giving her origin and history to one better informed on the subject as well as to one more competent, and we shall anticipate the historian only so far as may be deemed necessary in order to a clearer insight of her *present* state.

Catawba college was founded about the year 1850, under the general directions of a Board of Trustees and the auspices of the North Carolina Classis of the Reformed church. The demand for better facilities for *secular* education in western North Carolina had long been felt by all, and the isolated condition of the North Carolina Classis made it her prerogative to inaugurate the movement toward meeting this demand. Moreover, the members of Classis entertained a distant hope of establishing a Theological Seminary in connection with the Classical Department, to obviate the necessity of sending their sons to other States and climes where they should breathe a *new* and *un-Reformed* Theological atmosphere. The school at once began to flourish, and, subsequently, under the management of Rev. A. S. Vaughan, acquired such a degree of prosperity, that an *endowment fund* was almost raised, and our hearts beat high with the knowledge that our most ardent hopes were about to be realized. Then war blasted our hopes, wasted our energies, impaired our fortunes, and almost annihilated the thought of endowment.

But again Catawba college is raising her head from the dust,



and again many are looking forward to the time when she shall stand forth, purified by suffering, among the noblest literary monuments of our land. As to educational influence, health, morals, and good society, the situation of our college in Newton, is one of the finest in the Union. Our town contains not a single bar-room, and an act of legislature prohibits the sale of any intoxicating liquors within two miles of the college precincts. Board in private families can be secured at any time at from eight to ten dollars per month, and there is no excuse for ignorance on the plea of poverty. The building, though neat and comfortable, is scarcely large enough for our present school purposes, and we are sadly in need of a boarding hall in order that pupils from a distance may be kept together and allowed better facilities for moral and religious culture. Two small but well selected libraries belong to the two societies in connection with the college.

Special opportunities are afforded the students of the present term in the way of *lectures*. These have been delivered from time to time on *Physiology*, by Dr. J. R. Campbell, and on *Political Economy* by Hon. M. L. McCorkle. Maj. S. M. Finger, a graduate of Bowdoin college, will lecture upon the more important subjects embraced in Natural Philosophy. As intimated above, the impoverished condition of the South renders it still impracticable to employ a full corps of teachers, in order to carry on the work of a *college*. This explains why, instead of announcing "Catawba college" to the public, we have preferred calling it "Catawba English and Classical High School." In spite of our poverty, however, the school is in a more flourishing condition than it has been for years. The Principal, Rev. J. C. Clapp, has evinced such rare executive ability as has secured for him the confidence and patronage of all who know him. Mild and persuasive, yet *firm*, he has succeeded in winning the affection and respect of nearly every student who has been under his care for a period of *ten* years, and they can never forget with what parental authority and patience he dealt with their shortcomings. At a recent meeting of the Board of Trustees of Catawba college, J. A. Foil, late of Ursinus college, was elected to the Professorship of Greek and Moral Science, and J. D. Rowe, to that of Latin and Natural Sciences. We think we shall ere long have a full Faculty, as the prospects are more than usually encouraging. Education has received a new impetus. Experience is every day

teaching us how incompetent are the ignorant, *uneducated* and *unprincipled*, to bear rule. We would have our future legislators, intelligent, educated, and if possible, religious men, and that Catawba college may send out many such, is our earnest wish and prayer. Her influence is felt throughout the whole of western North Carolina, and many ministers, lawyers, and physicians who received their only classical education here, are serving their countrymen acceptably, ornaments to their professions and gems in society, whilst scores of our most competent teachers boast of having received their normal instruction here.

In our institution, superficial study is not tolerated, and promotion comes only with merit. The instructors are true Evangelical Reformed, but sectarianism and "tendencies" are carefully avoided in the school-room, and thus our college becomes a *true* Alma Mater to Baptists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists and Reformed, and we think that these alike will hail the day when she shall equal in reputation the best in our land.

F.

---

#### ITEMS.

*Labor is Success.*—"What is your secret of success?" asked a lady of *Turner*, the distinguished painter. He replied: "I have no secret, madam, but hard work."

Says *Dr. Arnold*: "The difference between one boy and another is not so much in talent as in energy."

"Nothing," says *Reynolds*, "is denied well-directed labor, and nothing is to be attained without it."

"Excellence in any department," says *Fohnson*, "can now be attained only by the labor of a lifetime; it is not to be purchased at a lesser price."

"There is but one method," said *Sydney Smith*, "and that is hard labor; and a man who will not pay that price for distinction had better at once dedicate himself to the pursuit of the fox."

"Step by step," reads the French proverb, "one goes very far."

"Nothing," says *Mirabeau*, "is impossible to the man who

can will: "Is that necessary?" "That shall be." This is the only law of success."

"Have you ever entered a cottage, ever traveled in a coach, ever talked with a peasant in the field, or loitered with a mechanic at the loom," says *Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton*, "and not found that each of those men had a talent you had not—knew something you knew not?"

*Curious Title of an Old Arithmetic.*—"The Arte of Vulgar Arithmeticke, both in Integers and Fractions, divided into two Bookes, whereof the first is called *Nomodidactus Numcrorum*, and the second *Portus Proportionum*, with certeine Demonstrations, reduced into so plaine and perfect Method, as the like hath not hetherto beene published in English. Whereunto is added a third Booke, entitled *Musa Mercatorum*, comprehending all the most necessarie and profitable Rules used in the trade of Merchandise. In all which three Bookes the rules, precepts, and maxims are onely composed in meeter for the better retaining of them in memorie, but also the operations, examples, demonstrations, and questions are in most easie wise expounded and explained, in the forme of a dialogue, for the reader's more cleere understanding. A knowledge pleasant for gentlemen, commendable for Capteines and soldiers, profitable for merchants, and generally necessarie for all estates and degrees. Newly collected, digested, and in some part devised by a welwiller to the Mathematics, by Thomas Hylles.

"Imprinted at London by Gabriel Simson, dwelling in Fleet-lane, 1600. 540 pp. quarto." There, boys and girls, how would you like that for a text-book?

In our October issue a brief notice was taken of an unwarranted and malicious assault made upon our recent Biennial orator. The sheet containing the assault was received only a few hours before the last copy for October was forwarded, and hence the notice of it was hurriedly prepared. On subsequent examination of documents, it was discovered that a mistake was inadvertantly made, in stating that the Biennial oration was almost entirely a repetition of one delivered by the respected author in Lancaster, in 1859. It is found, in fact, that the later address is, in large measure, new. Of course the author had a full right to make any use he chose of an earlier production, and no sensible person would



complain of his having done so. But it is due to him that the facts in the case should be correctly given.

In this connection we volunteer a word in regard to the rude and calumnious charge of wholesale plagiarism, so odiously exhibited by "College Days." A careful comparison of the two addresses has corroborated our impromptu conviction, that the charge as made could not be fairly sustained. Beyond a general correspondence in the mode of treating the subject, which was entirely natural, as the subject scarcely allows of a wholly original method of treatment, and beyond the use of the same historical illustrations, which can be found scattered through hundreds of addresses, essays and books written long before Prof. Smith's address was delivered or published—the two addresses are quite sufficiently unlike to give to each its own distinctive merit, and vindicate Dr. Kremer against the aspersion of "College Days." On its principle of criticism, it might have found better subjects for dissection without traveling so far from home.

We may only add, that the ungenerous assault made in this case has not in the least diminished the respect entertained here for the honored gentleman who has been so inexcusably maligned. In its style, as well as by the spirit betrayed, the assault has neutralized its power to harm.

*Acknowledgments for Educational aid in Ursinus College, from :*

Rev. J. Peters, Alexandria, Pa.....	\$26 18
Rev. Dr. Ziegler, York, Pa.....	45 00
Rev. F. S. Lindaman, Blaine, Pa.....	30 00
Rev. R. S. Appel, Hamburg, Pa.....	12 00
Rev. Geo. Wolff, Myerstown.....	30 00

*For Home Missions in Philadelphia Classis :*

Rev. F. S. Lindaman.....	\$11 00
Rev. Geo. Wolff.....	25 00
Rev. A. B. Shenkel.....	27 50

---

THE Pope, in an address to a delegation of 300 of "the faithful," on the 2nd inst., used the following words: "Confusion has entered the enemy's camp. They strive to induce me, to leave Rome, but I never will."

## EDITOR'S DESK.

### THE DARK LIST.

THE MONTHLY for October has done a service to the Reformed church, by publishing a list of ministers of our church who, under the Mercersburg movement, have been moved to go to Rome. It seems to me that it would be well to keep that list standing permanently, as a sort of memorial of the effects of this disastrous movement. There are hundreds of indications that but very few persons are any longer in doubt that the real reasons of these conversions must be sought for in the new-order theology. All other explanations are felt to be unsatisfactory. In the meanwhile the list ought to be made as complete as possible. To contribute a little to this end, I would remark that *David Snively* is put down in your list as having been merely a student in the seminary at Mercersburg. Such was my own impression, also, until lately. But in looking over the minutes of Synod, I see that he had progressed so far as to have become a Licentiate of the church. In the minutes of 1851 you will find his name given as a Licentiate of Mercersburg Classis, with P. O. address at Mercersburg. So also in the minutes of 1852. In 1853 he is given again as a Licentiate, with residence in Paris, France.

#### *Apostasies to Rome.*

*David Snively*, a Licentiate of Mercersburg Classis.

*Peter Coblentz*, a student at Mercersburg.

*Rev. Moses A. Stewart* (and wife?) formerly of Burkettsville, Md.

*Rev. John Wagner and wife*, formerly of Pittsburg, Pa.

*Miss ———*, Hagerstown, Md.

" " " " Easton, Pa.

" " " " Lancaster, Pa.

*Rev. Geo. Dering Wolff and wife*, Norristown, Pa.

*Rev. John S. Ermentrout*, formerly of Norristown, Pa.

*Prof. Chas. Budd*, not a member of the Reformed church, but a student of Mercersburg, and at the time of his apostasy a professor in Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.

*John Oliver, Esq.*, (a nephew of the Drs. Apple), of Allentown, Pa.

*Rev. E. O. Forney*, of Norristown, Pa.

*Rev. Wm. Phillips*, formerly pastor in Mercersburg. He first joined the Episcopal church, and then took the full step.

#### *Defections to the (Puseyite) Episcopal Church.*

*Rev. Aaron Christman*, formerly of Huntingdon, Pa.

*Lewis Zahner*, while a student at Franklin and Marshall, Lancaster.

— *Nevin*, son of Dr. J. W. Nevin, Lancaster.

*Rev. Robt. Nevin*, son of Dr. J. W. Nevin, now in the Episcopal chapel in Rome.

*Miss ———*, Lancaster, Pa.

*Rev. S. H. Giesy, D.D., and wife*, formerly of Christ church, Philadelphia.

*Rev. H. F. Hartman*, formerly of St. Paul's Classis.  
Two sons of the Rev. M. Kieffer, D.D.

*Evasions* are never fair, and mostly reprehensible. They involve untruth, besides other serious offences. The advocates of the Lancaster-Mercersburg theology have a very unhappy habit of resorting to such evasions when charged, upon specific proofs, with teaching certain errors. This has been seen in the case of the article on Regeneration by Baptism, the writer of which, in his subsequent defense, wholly ignoring or evading his assertion, that regeneration was effected through baptism, by a *conveyance of a divine substance* to the person baptized.

In like manner one of the Theological Faculty in Lancaster, in a recent vindication of his theology against the charge of *pantheism*, wholly evades that phraseology of his school by which, as literally quoted by us, the charge of its pantheistic character was sustained. He says that the doctrine of his theology is: "That regeneration, as distinguished from conversion, is that act of God by which we are ingrafted into Christ in a real, living way; so that, in virtue of the mystical union thus established, we are made partakers of the glorified life of the God-man," &c. (The entire paragraph will be quoted and considered in December).

Had the theology in question never expressed itself more explicitly than is done in this statement, no one would probably have ventured to accuse it of inculcating pantheistic views. Such views *might be lurking* under such phrases as "ingrafted into Christ in a real, living way," &c.; but they do not necessarily involve them. The language *may* bear an evangelical sense. It has, however, *not been for uttering such statements* that the school in question has been challenged; and the writer of the article referred to most probably knows it. He knows that the declarations *quoted* in proof of the charge of pantheism are far more outspoken than the very pleasant phraseology which he employs in the above passage. What has he to say to *them*? Will he please tell us how his school escapes pantheism in such assertions as: "*That life-breath which God breathed into Adam, when he became a living soul, cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God.*" And again, in harmony with this: "*The life of regeneration is an emanation, by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's divine-human life.*"

Such, and like declarations, have proclaimed what the Lancaster theology holds, and we want *them explained*, not specious and sophistical paraphrases of them.

But more of this hereafter.

A fraternal word to the "*Episcopalian*" is called for by a kind criticism upon our use of the term *sacraments*, in the articles on regeneration and Baptism. The term is objected to, because it is nowhere employed in the Scriptures, and is calculated to mislead the mind and faith in regard to the true design and import of the ordinances indicated by it. Doubtless there is force in these objections, just as similar objections hold against other theological and ecclesiastical terms not found in the Scriptures, as "bishop" and "Easter." But the



term *sacrament* is generally recognized by the most evangelical Confessions and theologians of the Reformed church, and has acquired a technical authority and sense. In this sense we use it, and are justified in the use of it. That ritualistic sacerdotalism abuses it, furnishes no sufficient reason for discarding it, or attempting to establish a new nomenclature. That false scheme abuses many other terms, and such as have the fullest scriptural warrant. And to change our theological lexicon so as to secure the language of evangelical christianity against the perversions of Papists, would lead to greater confusion and perplexity than their easily refuted perversions cause. And we have more than ever felt that our esteemed cotemporary of the *Episcopalian* and those whom he otherwise so ably represents, have erred in this very respect of pressing changes so radical as to be liable to misapprehension and misrepresentation, in matters of mere verbiage and phraseology. Overdone is also badly done.

*No answer yet* to the point-blank assertion of one of the Mercersburg theological party who apostatized to Rome, that Mr. Forney and others were led away from Protestantism and Romanism, by the teachings of the theological professors of our Eastern Synod's theological Seminary. Of course no one will accept as satisfactory those apologetic and evasive articles which have been lately published by the Theological Faculty at Lancaster. What is needed and demanded, is a fair, frank meeting of the charges so directly brought against the Faculty.

*Forced out.*—Our exposure of the bold stand taken by the Theological Faculty at Lancaster against the doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism regarding the atoning death of Jesus Christ, as the ground and foundation of our salvation, has had considerable effect. It has brought, or forced, the Faculty out into an attempted defence against the charge that their view is in flat contradiction with the settled faith of the church. This attempt is very significant in several respects.

1. It proves that the exposure of the contradiction "struck in," and was too keenly felt to allow it to pass unnoticed. It is the usual habit of the (supposed) author of the article in which the doctrine was assailed, to conceal his inability to answer or refute objections to views he may advance, under the cover of a prudent silence. Such silence may be construed by some persons into mere contempt for the objection as something not worthy of notice, though it might be easily refuted. In this case, however, the matter was too serious, and something had to be done. What extra pressure may have been brought to bear, we, of course, can't say. But the fact, that contrary to the usual custom, a special effort has been made to relieve the Faculty of the unpleasant position in which it was placed, plainly shows the working of some special necessity.

Such a necessity may well be admitted. The doctrine assailed is one of those most plainly taught in our Reformed standards (as it is in the Gospel) and most deeply rooted in the common hearty faith of the church. It is, moreover, one which our Reformed Pastors have been most diligently teaching in their catechetical classes to thousands and tens of thousands of catechumens from year to year. In its nature it is so simple and fundamental, as set forth in the

Scriptures and in the Catechism, that it has probably been better understood, and has taken deeper hold of the minds and hearts of the people, than almost any other doctrine. Any attempt, therefore, to oppose it would be more likely to attract attention, and to produce dissatisfaction and alarm. Many who could not see that the Lancaster-Mercersburg theory of the Incarnation necessarily involved a repudiation of the settled doctrine of the atonement, would at once discern the bearing of this more open and direct assault upon it. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary to come out in some sort of defence.

2. But how is the case met? We regret to say, that it is met, in large measure, sophistically and evasively. And yet under all, the thoughtful, critical eye cannot fail to discern that the view urged and advocated is in direct opposition to the doctrine of the Catechism and our church. The writer says:

"That the atoning death of Christ is the principle of redemption, the Catechism does, in some of its Questions and Answers, *seem* to teach, because it lays much stress on the all-sufficiency of the one sacrifice of Christ, made for us on the cross. But, as we have shown in a previous article, the doctrine is in reality not taught by the Catechism. The opinion, that it does, is due to an interpretation, that, overlooking the historical relations of the Catechism, proceeds, in the light of a different assumption. There is in its teaching, no implied antithesis of the death to the birth or resurrection of Christ, much less to His divine human person. But the doctrine of the all-sufficiency of the atoning sacrifice of Christ stands opposed to certain Roman errors, which involve a contrary view of His sacrifice."

"*Seem*" to teach it, indeed! There is no mere seeming about it, as has been shown in the first article of our present number. It teaches it as explicitly as a doctrine can be taught, and the writer of the quotation did not show the contrary, in a previous article of his; he only attempted to do so, and failed.

To say that all the Catechism meant by the *emphasis* which "*seems*" to be laid upon the doctrine, was to exhibit its doctrine of the atoning sacrifice of Christ in contrast with and in opposition to "*certain Roman errors.*" Now it may doubtless be grateful to some persons to find a member of the Theological Faculty at Lancaster, waking up at last (since the recent apostasies, and since the unreserved exposure of the theology of that school as the occasion of them) to so keen a sense of Romish error. And it may not be denied, that incidentally, and by inference, the doctrine of the Catechism does stand in opposition to the Romish view of the matter. But whoever before thought of this as the chief purpose of the form of statement found in the Catechism? The very assumption of such a purpose is contrary to the entire connection in which the doctrine is so plainly affirmed.

Let the case be brought, however, to a very simple test. If the strange view advocated is correct, why does the Catechism, in Question and Answer 16, teach and most plainly declare the great necessity for the education of Christ to be this: "*Because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which hath sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin;*" and again (in Question 17) that Jesus Christ as God "*incarnate,*" *might by the power of His*



Godhead, sustain in His human nature, the burden of God's wrath, and (so) obtain for and restore to us, righteousness and life?"

Here we have, impliedly, the same doctrine, that the atoning sacrifice of Christ is the ground and foundation of our salvation. Do these questions and answers also only seem to teach the doctrine? Were they, likewise, framed as they are, only to set forth some peculiarity of the Reformed faith in contrast with and in opposition to some Romish error?

No. Let the truth be freely told, and frankly admitted. The school represented by the writer quoted above, holds a theory of the Incarnation unknown to, and utterly at variance with Reformed, and indeed all evangelical theology. And now it tries to force upon the Catechism a construction at variance with its true historical, and generally accepted sense, which shall make it square with that view, erroneous, and, (as we believe and think we have shown heretofore) pantheistic theory of the Incarnation. But here we must pause for the present.

"Our Church Paper" (Pittsburg), in a recent issue, earnestly pleads for a cessation of controversy, and a return to cordial unity, &c., in our church. It does so on very plausible grounds. None could more sincerely reciprocate its wishes, and the reasons assigned for them, than ourselves. We have from the first deplored the existing state of things, and the unhappy effects of it.

But deeply as we have deplored this, we have still more deprecated the necessity for controversy forced upon the church by the very diligent efforts made to subvert (fundamentally) our faith and practice as a church.

Will "Our Church Paper" please state definitely upon what terms it advocates a return to peace? Shall the church succumb to the innovations in doctrine and life? Shall the doctrine of the incarnation, as ever held and taught by the Reformed church; of the atoning death of Christ, as the ground and foundation of our salvation; of the work of the Spirit upon the individual heart; of justification by faith in the old evangelical Reformed sense; of personal assurance of the forgiveness of sins, obtained directly from God in Christ (as opposed to sacerdotal absolution); of the Sacraments, as signs and seals, in the old Reformed sense; of the self-authenticating power of the Gospel, &c., &c.—shall all these be abandoned, and sacrificed on the altar of the peace desired, and the dogmas of Mercersburg theology be accepted and substituted in their stead?

Or shall the church rather speak out in rebuke of those errors, solemnly reaffirm its adherence to its old apostolic faith and practice, and thus have peace restored? Will "Our Church Paper" please answer. It knows that our controversy has been one, not merely of words, but has concerned most essential and vital points. Can any desirable or permanent peace be secured by a mere silent concession of those points? Let "Our Church Paper" frankly speak out its mind upon the issues at stake.



## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM *Scribner, Armstrong & Co.*, 654 Broadway, New York :  
*The Holy Bible*, According to the Authorized Version, (A. D. 1611.) With  
 an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation,  
 by Bishops and other clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. Cook,  
 M. A., Canon of Exeter. Vol. III. 2 Kings—Esther. Scribner, Armstrong &  
 Co., New York. For sale by Claxton & Co., 620 Market street, Phila. 8vo., pp  
 499. Price \$5.00.

This Commentary bears acquaintance, and improves upon it. At first, the brevity of its critical and explanatory notes is calculated to make an unfavorable impression. Upon more frequent reference to it, however, for aid upon doubtful or difficult points, it is found to give great satisfaction, and generally supplies what is needed. George Rawlinson, the distinguished oriental scholar, has furnished an introductory essay to the several books comprised in this volume (2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther), which will be found exceedingly valuable. No living scholar is better fitted for the task than he.

The *Evangelist* (German), of Cleveland, has again been placed in the hands of Dr. Ruetenik, as editor. Under Brother *Greding* it was very ably and vigorously conducted. But, in connection with his arduous pastoral duties, the task of editing it was too severe a tax upon his time and strength. Dr. Ruetenik is now to devote himself wholly to the work; and his ability and experience warrant the confident expectation that the *Evangelist* will continue to be the best German paper in our church. After New Year it is to be enlarged to nearly double its present size.

The *Quarterlies*, the *Presbyterian*, and the *Bibliotheka Sacra* for October have not yet been received.

*The Chromo Catch* is pretty nearly played out. Probably, in the majority of cases, persons who were captivated by the powerful attraction of securing a "splendid picture," worth double the price of the periodical which offered it as a bonus to each subscriber paying a year's subscription, have felt disappointed with the "premium." They have found that the "splendid chromo" was a poor affair—on close examination really but little, if any, better than some pictures on fire-board paper, to be had at any country store for twenty-five cents, or less.

On artistic grounds the deception (for it amounts to this) is to be deprecated. It is wrong to educate the eye of people not experienced in such matters, by such miserable specimens of art!

But on moral grounds the matter is still more to be condemned. It is wrong to make people think that they are getting a picture worth a sum for which more than a score of them really costs.

The following, from one of our very best religious papers, the *New York Observer*, is directly to the point, and quite to our mind:

"No weekly newspaper, such as the *New York Observer* is, and will always be, can be published for less than three dollars a year, while prices of labor and paper continue as they have been for some years past. If anything valuable is offered to a subscriber in addition to his newspaper, it must be deducted from the cost of the paper, and the value so much diminished. We cannot offer a Chromo (price \$5,) because we would deceive our subscribers by so doing. Manufacturers offer to furnish us such chromos for 15 or 20 cents each, and agree to sell them to no one else for less than \$5.00 each. This would enable us to say that we will give a chromo which cannot be bought for less than \$5.00, to every new subscriber, but in so saying we should deceive our readers, who would suppose they were getting something worth five dollars, whereas it was not worth twenty-five cents !!! The morality of such offers we do not pronounce upon, but we decline participating in them."

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR OWN CHURCH.—*Ministerial Changes.* Rev. Dr. Ruetenik has resigned his professorship in the *Howard's Grove* Mission House, to resume the editorial management of the *Evangelist*, and superintend the publication interests at *Cleveland, Ohio.* Rev. C. G. Fisher, from *Blue Bell, Pa.*, to *Winchester Va.* Rev. D. Wolff from *Arendtsville, Pa.*, to *Petersburg, Pa.*

DEDICATION. The new church at *Rieglesville, Pa.*, was dedicated with appropriate services on *October 12.* It cost \$14,200, and is paid for.

DEATH. Rev. Samuel Miller, formerly of *Pottsville*, in *Philadelphia*, on *October 11*, in the 59th year of his age. He was buried in *Lebanon* on *October 15*, the funeral services being held in the *First Reformed church of Lebanon.* Bro. Miller had an active, penetrating mind, was regarded as an excellent preacher, and exhibited great energy to the last. His health has been feeble for many years, but during the past year his disease (pulmonary) increased, and was at times very distressing. Nevertheless he continued to preach, and with great vigor, until a few weeks before his death, bearing his trial with Christian resignation, and departing in peace.

THE EASTERN SYNOD convened at *Bloomsburg, Columbia Co., Pa.*, on *October 15*, and was organized by the election of the Rev. C. H. Leinbach, by acclamation, as President.

In connection with the usual business claiming attention, two or three items of special interest were disposed of.

1. The Classis of *Mercersburg* having been dissatisfied with the action of the General Synod in the *Dunn* appeal case, requested the Eastern Synod to overture the next General Synod to revise the action of the Synod of *Cincinnati* in

the case, on the ground that the vote sustaining the appeal, &c., did not fairly represent the mind of the church.

The Eastern Synod refused to comply with the request, regarding the vote as valid when taken, and endorsing as correct the general principle established in the case. It was gratifying to find the evidently false position taken in regard to this whole matter by the Classis of Mercersburg, so decidedly rejected by the Eastern Synod.

This action of the Bloomsburg Synod also involves a rebuke, if we mistake not, to the Classis of Lancaster, Pa., for some resolutions passed by that Classis in regard to assessments for benevolent purposes. In spirit, at least, those resolutions were at variance with the rule adopted by the General Synod. By some oversight, probably, attention was not called to them.

A principle and law of christian beneficence so plain and equitable, one might suppose would have been admitted without contradiction. To assess christians and christian congregations for special benevolent objects and demand that the amount assessed be raised, or that even special efforts should be made to do so, is clearly contrary to the Gospel law of almsgiving.

Now, however, the principle is conceded. Every congregation, and every member, is free to exercise christian discretion in giving, and in designating to what particular object or institution the amount contributed shall be applied.

2. Another, no less important, principle was recognized and confirmed by the Synod of Bloomsburg. It occurred in connection with an appeal from the action of the Classis of East Susquehannah.

In a certain case before it that Classis had so decided the case, that one of its members was, at least impliedly, pronounced guilty of a serious moral offence, *without a proper trial*. From this the injured member, who was fully prepared to disprove the charge, appealed, as it was right he should. *The Synod unanimously sustained the appeal.*

By this decision the Synod declared the gross injustice of condemning any one without affording him a full opportunity of defence, by a fair trial according to the constitution. And the decision was unanimous.

In this case it seemed evident that the Classis had not been at all prompted by any personal ill-will. Its action was rather an inadvertancy. Nevertheless the Synod's decision fell as a rebuke.

3. A third item deemed worthy of notice occurred in connection with the report of the committee on the Theological Seminary. The report contained a sentence or clause declaring the instructions given in the Seminary to be in accordance with the doctrines of the Reformed church.

To this objections were raised, on the ground that the Synod could not certainly know what was affirmed, and should not, therefore, commit itself by such action.

On the vote a decision was called for. Only 23 stood up on the affirmative, whilst 6 voted in the negative, leaving thus a majority of the members who preferred not to vote at all.

All such attempts to secure Synodical indorsement for any peculiar set of views must be pronounced unwise. If the peculiar theology in question desires



formal endorsement, let it state and submit its distinctive views fairly and unequivocally, and in this way seek what is thought by its advocates to be desirable. This has never yet been done. And whatever may be claimed to the contrary, no Synod has ever yet formally endorsed the peculiar tenets of the theology in question.

Indeed so far as its views are peculiar and new, and involve a fundamental change in the faith of the church, no Synod *has a right to adopt* them.

THE POTOMAC SYNOD met in Chambersburg on October 22. As yet we have no account of its proceedings.

A PROTESTANT missionary in Mexico gives the following graphic account of the blood-thirsty spirit which is manifested toward Protestants by Romanists in Mexico, showing that now, as in all past times, they are ready to resort to assassination to carry out their aims:

"After having celebrated divine service and baptized a child in the town of Capulhuac, where the congregation consists of forty persons, we said farewell to the families of our brethren in that town, and started for the neighboring village of Santiago. There soon met us some fifteen Romanists, armed with rifles, pistols and daggers. A shot was fired at me, but Jesus turned the ball from me, so that it only struck the ground near me. Several men then attacked us. Some of our brethren wanted to resist their rude attack, but I said to them, 'Let there be no blood shed by us, brethren; all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.' These words of our Saviour disarmed my brethren, who then turned their thoughts in prayer to the Lord of life and death. Our brethren were ready to die for the holy cause of the Gospel with all the calmness of true Christians, who know that after death they will immediately enter into the joys of the other world, through the sufferings and merits of Jesus Christ our Saviour. We then moved on about the distance of a hundred yards, when I was suddenly struck on the head. The blow clouded my sight, but my mind was firmly fixed on the cross of Golgotha. One of our assailants was then about trying to bury his dagger in my heart, when one of our brethren of the congregation of Capulhuac threw himself between my person and the raised arm of the assailant. This brother received the blow of the dagger in my stead. It mortally wounded him. He was at once borne back to a house in Capulhuac. The Roman curate Estrada soon presented himself there to try and confess the dying Christian. The wounded man explained, however, 'I have already confessed myself, and am completely pardoned through the merits and most sacred death of Jesus Christ, my Redeemer;' and having said these words he fell asleep in the Lord. Happy Christian! he will no longer have to suffer the tribulations that await us here. Three others of the brethren who were with me were wounded. Their words for their persecutors were, 'Lord, pardon them, for they know not what they do.' Blessed is our religion that teaches us to love even our enemies. I afterward went to the town of Joquicingo. The congregation there numbered two hundred persons. The minister who is at the front of this congregation is a true Christian; his preaching is entirely evangelical. I have thus finished this particular mission that you entrusted to me to visit these con-

gregations. Do not let us lament the fact that our brethren should have had to shed their blood; that but waters the harvest of Jesus. For those who killed one of our brethren, and wounded others; for those who sought men to kill the infant that I had just baptized in Capulhuac—let there be on our part only pardon and love, as our Lord commands us in the Gospel."

THE *Christian at Work* says, the beautiful spire of Strasburg Cathedral which was so injured by the Germans in their bombardment of the city, is now being carefully restored. This magnificent structure has seen many perils but escaped them all. Shaken by four earthquakes, struck by lightning, ravaged by fire five times, notwithstanding the fury of the Jacobins, in 1793, who tore down over two hundred statues, and proposed to treat its lofty spire as they treated the Column in the Place Vendome in Paris eighty years later—it still lays its gilded cross against the heavens.

THE *New York Graphic*, during the meetings of the Evangelical Alliance in that city, contained the following *personnel* of the convention:

It is as remarkable as its purpose. It is made up of picked men. It represents the scholarship, the conscience, the piety, the moral worth of Protestant orthodoxy. But this convention has brought together a greater number of distinguished and really eminent Protestant divines than was ever assembled before. Those who represent the pulpit as in its dotage, and the church as in its decadence, have only to look over an assembly like this to see what culture and intellectual force the one possesses, and how much vigor and vitality the other retains. The president of the convention, the venerable ex-president of Yale College, is a distinguished name in American culture, and quite as much an authority in political as in theological departments. Robert C. Winthrop, a former Speaker of the House of Representatives, is an elegant historical scholar and writer. Professor Dörner, of Germany, is one of the leading theologians of Europe, and an author of world-wide fame. Prof. Henry of the Smithsonian Institute, is celebrated in science, and Prof. Schaff has earned a literary reputation in two languages. Dr. Hodge, of Princeton college, is one of the best-read of old-school theologians in the country, and his name carries a weight of authority possessed by few others. Stanley Leathes, and Dr. Angus, of London, and Dr. Arnot of Edinburgh, are well-known and honored names. Krummacher, of Brandenburg; Spiess, of Jena; Astis, of Geneva; Christlieb, of Bonn, and Zimmerman, of Leipsic, are eminent out of the church as well as in it, and their fame as scholars has preceded them hither. And these names, snatched out of the vast collection, like a handful of flowers from a basket, merely show what personal elements enter into this convention and give character to its proceedings. And the pride of Protestantism is its personalities.

THE JEWS AND THE ALLIANCE.—With the object and aim of the Alliance, the *Jewish Messenger* claims that the Jew has much sympathy. If doctrinal points, it says, separate the Jew and Christian, both base their hopes on the same God, and rest their aspirations on the same Book. It matters little whether the Messiah has arrived or not, so long as men act the Messianic, try to realize

among themselves those principles of justice, love and philanthropy, which the devout believe the Messianic age will diffuse throughout the universe. The Jew, too, can have no sympathy with arrogant Romanism, or destructive Rationalism, which the Alliance opposes with its array of eminent workers in the branches of science, literature, and theology, all of whom are fully abreast with the spirit of the age, while some, rightly spurning the boundaries of sects, have obtained a Pisgah-view of the promised land beyond.

THE Romish church has met with another check, in Brazil, in asserting her extravagant claims to determine the civil as well as the spiritual status of individuals. The question whether Protestant marriages are dissolved by the conversion of one of the wedded pair to Catholicism has been decided against her. Many Brazilian jurists defended this monstrous assumption, the Catholic bishops sanctioning the re-marriage of converts without regard to their existing wedlock. This state of things has now come to an end through the instrumentality of Herr Hermann Haupt, who, being in Rio Janeiro, while the post of German Charge d'Affaires in that capital was vacant, called the attention of the Government to the re-marriage of two German converts whose Protestant husbands were still alive. The Emperor, after consulting the State Council, decided that Protestant marriages are indissoluble except by judicial decree, that the two women had incurred the guilt of bigamy, and that they and the priests who performed the ceremony of marriage had laid themselves open to a criminal prosecution.

SOME idea may be had of the interest the Jews have in their religion by the sacrifices they make for it. At the sale of the pews in a new Jewish Temple in New York, \$200,040 were realized.

THE *Jewish* World says of a Papyrus manuscript found in a tomb in Egypt, and recently translated: "It is stated to be an address of Rameses III, to all the nations of the world, in which the King details minutely all the causes which led to the exodus of the Jews from the land of the Pharaohs."

THE CONFLICT BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE IN GERMANY.—The duel between Bismarck and the church goes on without relenting on either side. Both parties are obstinate, though at present the German statesman is master of the field. To place the facts clearly before our readers, it may be well to review the events of the struggle thus far. The first great measure of the Empire in the protection of its sovereignty, the expulsion of the Jesuits and kindred bodies, is now well known. The act is not without precedent, for the Jesuits have been frequently expelled from the states of Europe. The Catholic hierarchy have universally taken up the cause of their Jesuit brethren; they are regarded as martyrs for the sake of the church. The second important measure is the law requiring Catholic priests to be educated in the State universities. The nature and operation of this law are thus described in the *Pall Mall Gazette*:

"The common law in Germany—whether wisely or unwisely it is not for us to decide—exacts from every citizen who proposes to enter any professional career, be it that of a physician, a lawyer, a clergyman, a tutor, or a civil official,



a course of from two to four years of university study. To this rule the Catholic clergy cheerfully submitted in those balmy days when religious strife slumbered in Germany—that is to say, from 1638 to 1830 or thereabout. But when the Roman church began to lift her head and take the offensive against all opponents—namely, about 1835—the universities, where future priests had mixed with future clergyman, doctors, lawyers, and professors, and saw a good deal of real life, began to be abandoned. Everywhere seminaries were founded where the future apostle was sequestered, from the age of ten or twelve up to twenty or twenty-one, when he definitively took orders, from all contact with the world."

Both these acts have the same object—an object which Bismarck steadily pursues. They aim to prevent the growing up in the State of an organized body hostile to the State. The Jesuit is segregated from the world, and knows no sovereign but his superior; the priest, educated apart from all other young men in the State, has no interest in common with them, and is better fitted to be a pliant instrument of the Papacy. In the latter measure, Bismarck has struck the church a heavy blow. The priests' seminaries are closed, but the Catholic clergy declare that they will not obey the new law. We shall see.—*Methodist*.

THE entire Persian mission, with forty missionaries and sixty teachers, now under the care of the Presbyterian Board, costs less annually than the current expenses of some of our city churches.

THE Baptist mission among the Teloogoos has been wonderfully successful. The missionaries opened a school for the training of native preachers in 1870, under a banian-tree, where it continued for several months. The sand was blackboard and slate, and the point of the fore-finger chalk and pencil. The pupils now number more than fifty, all of whom are acting as native assistants.

REV. DR. LITLEDALE, of England, puts down the ministers of the Established Church of England at 20,000. Of these, he says, 2000 belong to the Broad-church party, 3000 to what he calls the Colorless or Nondescript, 5000 to the Low-church, and 10,000 to the various attitudes of the High-church party. The Low-church party, it may be feared, is largely declining in numbers and power.

THE Rev. Mr. Terry, rector of St. John's, Brooklyn, is about to visit Geneva, and establish an American Episcopal church in that home of Calvin. Mr. Terry is a very genial gentleman; but as a churchman he is high, very high, bordering on ritualism. In his dress, postures and sacraments he is nearly equal to Mr. Ewer. Whether that line of procedure will be popular with Americans abroad is a question.

# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

FALL TERM. 1873.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The FALL TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, commences Monday SEPTEMBER, 1, 1873, and continues sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 4 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. Its sessions correspond with those of the Academic Department. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A. M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A. M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

H. T. SPANGLER, A. B., and J. H. SECHLER, A. B., Instructors in the Academic Department.

A. E. DAHLMAN, Tutor.

H. J. WELKER, Instructor in Penmanship.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.

THE  
REFORMED CHURCH  
MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VI.—DECEMBER, 1873.—No. 12.

---

KNOWING GOD ARIGHT.

PERSONAL faith in God is the first article in the Christian creed.

That this is *the proper place* for the article, could be clearly proven from the Word of God. Both the law and the Gospel start with God ; and both also lead to Him and end in Him.

This is attested by the Christian consciousness of all ages, uttering its deepest sense and conviction through the Creed. The places assigned at different periods in the history of the church to other articles, were changed. Those in which faith in the person of the Holy Trinity was avowed, always remained as at the beginning, and always in the same order. First, faith in God the Father ; next, in God the Son, and then faith in God the Holy Ghost. Equally full, undoubting, reverential and loving faith is called for and declared in each case, as one and the same faith in the one triune God. But so far as there can be a *first* in the case: faith in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, come first.

It is easy to see the significance of this fact. Two important lessons among others, are taught by it.

1. It teaches that all true religion, as well as all personal piety, rests in its deepest foundation, on the fact of the being of God, as God.

2. As another lesson flowing from this, and inseparably connected with it, the fact noticed teaches that all true religion, as a personal matter, requires a right apprehension of God, as the



necessary basis or condition of reverent, obedient, and confiding love to Him, as God.

But this now evidently involves *the necessity of rightly knowing God*. For the faith required is not mere empty belief, if such a thing can be conceived. All belief must have contents; that is, there must be something which is believed; an object, or objects on which faith lays hold, in which faith trusts. This is most especially true of Christian faith, as the faith of rational-moral beings. But in order that this may be done, the thing believed must be known; the object or objects on which our faith lays hold, must be perceived by our reason. So, to believe in God at all, we must have some knowledge of God; must at least know that He is, and that He is God. "How shall men believe in Him of whom they have not heard?" In this question of St. Paul, hearing is the organ or medium of a rational knowledge, and he asserts the necessity of such knowledge in order to faith, as something which may challenge contradiction, and proves the importance of the *preaching* of the gospel.

But this is not all. It is not enough to know something, or to suppose we know something in regard to God, and then taking that for the truth, have faith in Him as so known. That might not be a Christian faith. True faith requires true knowledge. We must *rightly know God*, in order rightly to believe in Him. Only when we possess such a correct knowledge of God, can we use the first article of the Creed in its proper sense.

There are wrong, false notions of God. Indeed, there are, as we well know, many such. Among the heathen such false notions abound, and abound in most corrupt and gross forms, exhibited in their idolatries.

Such false views of God are, however, not confined to heathen nations. They may, alas, be found among those whom God Himself has sought to illumine with the light of His truth. The fact is, that notwithstanding all the means we may enjoy for coming to a right knowledge of God, we may still let our mind be misled by error in regard to this fundamental doctrine of religion.

The most common error among those in Christian lands who seem to give any serious attention to this subject, is *that which confounds God with His works*. They look upon nature as somehow *growing out* of God, according to a law of His being like

that which makes an oak spring from an acorn. They allow, of course, that in the case of God, this law, which is sometimes called evolution, and *emanation*, and organic development, by works in a more exalted, refined, and mysterious, subtle way. Nevertheless, they hold and teach that there is such a natural, living, organic connection between the Creator and creation.

Some hold and defend this opinion in a very gross form, denying that God is an intelligent, personal being. They maintain that what men call God, is nothing more than a mighty, mysterious, eternal *power* in matter, before matter took the shape of sun, moon and stars, and by the inner-working of which in a way which cannot be explained, the things we see in the heavens and the earth were wrought into form and shape, and animated by life produced in this way. The highest and noblest form of this process of development is said to be reached in man. Hence, man is god, so far as there is any being which can be called God. This is pantheism in its worst form. According to this theory God is the *all* (all things), and the *all* is God.

Others, shrinking from a notion of God and His relation to nature so gross as this, and one leading to such dreadful consequences, adopt a more refined view of the subject. They hold more or less clearly to the personality of God as infinite and eternal, and that all things owe their being to His will, as well as to His power. But still they maintain that nature or creation is produced somehow by a divinely-willed process of emanation out of the substance of God. In other words, they teach God created all things that have being, by causing His own life-substance to go out into them and make them what they are. He made all things out of Himself, by a grand and massive process of organic development. In this process man is declared to be the highest form of being yet reached.

A modification of this theory has been proposed and advocated by some who have felt the necessity of reconciling it with Christianity. They start from the Christian doctrine of the incarnation of God the Son, and by misinterpreting certain passages of Scripture which refer to that doctrine, and show the relation of "the Word made flesh" to creation, and especially to the new creation (regeneration) in Him, try to prove that Christianity, or as they prefer to say, the church, is an emanation, through the Word incarnate, of the very life-substance of God himself.

This is not pantheism in the grosser form mentioned above. But every one must see that the view, or theory, is pantheizing (as Dr. Dorner has said) or pantheistic. It represents God as somehow mixed up with His creatures; as making them what they are by something like a real substance "flowing out" from Him over to, them; and as upholding them, not by an exercise of His Providence over and above them, but by the presence of His substance in them. The theory does, in reality, confound the being of God with that of those who are regarded as His "workmanship," and who are upheld by His power.

It would lead us too far from our present purpose to follow up this theory by a fuller statement of it. Such a fuller statement would, also, hardly be interesting or profitable to our readers. The theory has been noticed at all, only because it presents one of the false forms in which the doctrine concerning God has been taught, and because it is advocated even by some professedly orthodox theologians at the present day.

The hurtful influence of all such vain and false speculations must be manifest, and is to be greatly deplored. Those who indulge in them may be prompted by honest purposes and by desires to serve the cause of truth. They may hope that in this way they can explain things regarding the Creator and the creation in a manner in which will solve some mysteries, and silence modern skepticism, and especially the objections of modern materialists.

But, to mention nothing else, all such attempts not only involve a confounding of God with His creatures, but utterly confuse the minds of devout persons with regard to the whole doctrine of God.

In contrast with all vain speculation, which "darken counsel by words without knowledge," how simple, and how clear is the doctrine as stated in our Creed, and derived by it from the revelation which God has been pleased to give of Himself to man! According to this, rightly to know God, as the highest object of faith, is to know Him, in the first place, as "God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth."

Here a two-fold truth is presented in regard to God, as the object of our knowledge and faith; first, His essential, eternal fatherhood, in relation to all things; and secondly, the essential eternal distinction of His being and nature, as God, from all His works.



The former of these holds, especially with reference to His people, in our Lord Jesus Christ. This is distinctly taught in the Bible, and is, therefore, set forth in our Catechism.

It is the second point, however, which claims our particular notice now. According to that, we are to know and believe in God the Father, as the *Maker* of heaven and earth. How is this to be understood?

1. It teaches us to consider God as a person, truly and really so, in the highest and holiest sense, infinitely exalted as such, above all we can conceive or think. Whenever our minds and hearts devoutly turn towards Him, we are so to contemplate and think of Him. He is to be for us the real, eternal, infinite, "I am that I am," having His existence in such a personal sense, in Himself, and in that existence uniting all those holy attributes which He claims for Himself. Our believing minds and hearts, in meditating upon Him, are to consider Him as infinitely exalted, in His nature and being, above all other things that have being, and in no sense mixed up with them.

2. The article further teaches us to look upon things in nature, ourselves included, as *made by Him, not as flowing out of Him*. He is related to them, and they stand in relation to Him, but as their Creator, as their Maker. The relation, is that a Maker to the thing made, of a Creator to the thing created. And *He made them out of nothing, not out of Himself*. He by His mere word, called not only things in heaven, and earth into their present forms of existence; He created the matter out of which they were so made. He was from everlasting. But the matter out of which He formed the heavens and the earth, was not from everlasting. God was eternally before it, and called it into being, and then, by His will and Word said, let it be this, and let it be that.

Hence, as the first article of our faith teaches us to know God, the heavens and the earth are no part of Him, they did not emanate from Him, not even by His own personal will and command. They were *made* by Him. And when He says that He made them "by the breath of His mouth," our faith does not misapprehend the saying, by taking it to mean that this breath was some substantial fluid, or matter, however refined, which issued from the being of God, and became, by His will, the heavens and the earth—but that the declaration means simply as much as command, His uttered will. So, too, when it said He breathed

into Adam "the breath of life," we do not take it to mean that any substance of God was breathed into Adam, making him thus a living soul, but that God by His almighty creative power gave to the body of Adam the life which was made to animate it.

Thus God remains God, and His works are kept essentially and entirely distinct from Him, in their nature and being. He upholds, governs them, but does this as essentially distinct from them. The Creator remains Creator, alone in His divine essence, person, and attributes, and the creature continues creature, and never can be mixed up with the essence of the Creator.

Let all hold fast to this simple faith. It may involve difficulties for those of our limited powers of thought. But the difficulties it involves, are utterly insignificant in comparison with those of pantheism and all pantheistic theories, whether these claim to be Christian or not. This faith preserves to us the God of our fathers, and above all, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and enables us when we pray, to say, with as distinct a conception of God as it is possible for finite minds to have: Our Father who art in heaven.

So God has taught us in His Word to think of Him, to believe and trust in Him. And so, rejecting as illusive, false, and destructive of true devotion, all vain theosophic attempts of theological dreamers, will we, by His grace, ever worship and trust in Him, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

---

## THE SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION.

### CHAPTER XXVIII.

#### *Of the Property of the Church.*

THE church of Christ possesses wealth through the liberality of the princes and of believers, who have given their goods to the church. For the church has need of such property, and has from the most ancient times devoted the same for the maintenance of things necessary for the church. The right use of the property of the church was then, and is now, the following: the preservation of doctrine through schools and churches, the worship in

general, the rites and the sacred edifices, support of teachers, scholars and ministers, besides often necessary things, and especially the care and relief of the poor. Hence there must be chosen God-fearing and wise men, skilled in government, rightly to administer the property of the church.

But if the properties of the church have been misused in consequence of evil times, coldness, ignorance or avarice, they ought to be restored again to a sacred use by pious and wise men. For we must not yield to such an impious abuse. Hence we teach, that the schools and colleges which have fallen into corruption in doctrine, cultus and manners, must be reformed; and that the support of the poor must be arranged faithfully, wisely and piously.

*Of Single Life, Wedlock and Household Government.*

Whoever has received from above the gift of single life, so that in heart and mind he is pure and chaste, and suffers not with passion, let him serve God in this calling so long as he feels that this divine gift is given to him, and let him not lift himself above others, but serve the Lord constantly in simplicity and humility. For such are more fit for the care of divine things than those who are distracted with the cares of a family. If the gift be again taken away, so that they suffer from passion, let them call to mind the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 7: 9.

For marriage (a medicine of incontinency, and itself a continency), is an ordination of God (Matt. 19: 5), who has richly blessed it, and who has willed it that man and woman cleave mutually to each other and live with one another in highest love and concord.

Hence the teaching of the Apostle in Heb. 13: 4. 1 Cor. 7: 28 Hence we condemn all polygamy and those who condemn second marriages.

We teach that marriage ought to be entered upon lawfully in the fear of God, and not contrary to the laws which forbid certain degrees of consanguinity, lest the marriages be incestuous. It must be entered upon with the consent of the parents or those who stand in their places, and especially for this end for which the Lord instituted it. It must be preserved sacred, with the greatest faithfulness, piety, love and purity. Disputes, angers, lusts and adultery must be avoided. Therefore, let lawful courts and just judges be established in the church, who may watch over



the marriages, and restrain all shamelessness, and by whom controversies in matrimony may be investigated and judged.

Let the children be trained by their parents in the fear of the Lord, remembering the exhortation of the Apostle in 1 Tim. 5: 8. Especially let them so teach their children, that they may maintain themselves in honest arts (or trades); accustoming them to industry, and planting in them in all this a true trust in God, that they may neither fall into distrust, nor foolish security, or filthy covetousness, and in the end come to no good. Now it is certain that these works which parents do out of true faith, in the circle of household and parental duties, are before God holy and good works, indeed, and not less pleasing to Him than prayers, fasts and alms. For so the Apostle also teaches in his epistles, especially to Timothy and Titus, 1 Tim. 4: 1. But with the same Apostle we reckon *that* a doctrine of the devil (1 Tim. 4: 1) which forbids marriage, or publicly contemns it, or casts disgrace upon it, as though it were not holy and pure. We detest the impure single life, the public and secret lusts and adultery of the hypocrites, who pretend to be continent, but yet are the most incontinent of all. All that be such, God will judge. We do not reject riches and rich men, if they be God-fearing and make a right use of their goods. But we reject the sect of the Apostolicals. 1 Tim. 6: 17.

#### CHAPTER XXX.

##### *Of those that are in Authority.*

All authority is ordained of God for the peace and quietness of mankind; and in truth so, that in this world it takes the highest place. If the magistrate is an adversary to the church, he can hinder and destroy much. Is he a friend or even member of the church, he can be the most useful and excellent member of the same, who may keep and further the church greatly. Rom. 13: 1.

His proper duty is to care for and preserve the public peace and quietness. This he can never fulfill more successfully than when he is himself God-fearing and pious; and according to the example of holy kings and princes of the people of the Lord, aids the preaching of the truth and the sincere faith, rooting out lies and all superstition, godlessness and idolatry, and protecting the church of God. Yea, we even teach that the care for religion belongs especially to the pious magistracy.

Let him, therefore, have at hand himself and care for the Word of God, that nothing be taught contrary thereto. Let him govern the people committed to his care of God, by good laws agreeing with the Word of God; and let him preserve them in discipline, duty and obedience. Let him exercise judgment by judging uprightly, not regarding the person, nor taking presents, protecting orphans and those in distress, and punishing, yea, cutting off the unjust, deceivers and violent. For he has not received from God the sword in vain against evil doers, seditious, murderers, oppressors, blasphemers, perjurers, and all whom God has commanded to punish and destroy, Rom. 13: 4. Let him also suppress *actual* stubborn heretics, who cease not to blaspheme the majesty of God; to distract, yea even to corrupt the church.

Where it may be necessary to preserve the safety of the people, he may also carry on war in the name of God, provided he have first sought peace by all means possible, and cannot preserve his subjects in any other way than by war. And when the government does this in faith, it serves God thereby as in truly good works, and receives the blessing of God. Deut. 17: 18, 19; 2 Chron. 19: 6.

We condemn the anabaptists who deny that a Christian can accept a governmental office, or that the government can lawfully punish by death, or carry on war, or that one is in duty bound to perform oaths to the same. For as God will work the welfare of His people through the magistrates, whom He has placed as fathers in the world, so all subjects are commanded to acknowledge this benefit of God. Therefore, it is our duty to honor those in authority, and to fear them, as the ministers of God; to love them, to be respectful to them and to pray for them as fathers; to obey all their just and proper commands; and finally, also, to pay willingly and faithfully all the taxes, tributes and similar duties. Now when the public welfare of the fatherland and justice requires it, and the government of necessity undertakes a war, we must lay down our lives and pour out our blood for the public weal and the government, and this, indeed, willingly, bravely and cheerfully. But whoever sets himself against the government, draws down the heavy wrath of God upon himself, Rom. 13: 2.

Consequently, we condemn all despisers of the government, and all rebels, all enemies of the commonwealth and seditious villains;

and, in a word, all who openly or secretly refuse to fulfill the duties incumbent upon them.

*We beseech God, our most merciful Father in heaven, that He will bless the rulers of the people, and us, and His whole people, through Jesus Christ our only Redeemer: to whom be praise, glory and thanksgiving both now and forever. Amen.*

---

#### STAND FAST IN THE FAITH.

THIS the Christians at Corinth were earnestly exhorted to do (1 Cor. 16: 13) by the Apostle who had been chiefly instrumental in leading them to Christ, and thus in establishing Christianity among them. They were admonished to do it *vigilantly*: "Watch," for they were in danger of growing drowsy in regard to the matter, and of falling asleep at their post. And should they fall asleep, Paul knew well that there was an enemy at hand who "while they slept, would sow tares" among them. Indeed, it had to some extent been done already. They were also urged to do it *manfully*: "Quit you like men," for Paul knew as well as Peter (see 1 Peter 5: 9), that the enemy of truth was a fierce adversary, of lion-like power, and had a terrible roar, which nothing but manly, dauntless courage, "steadfast in the faith, could resist."

And this all Christians are admonished to do. They should always do it. But there are seasons when there is special need of laying the admonition to heart, and of most earnestly striving to comply with it. Such a time is upon the churches of the Lord now, and most emphatically upon our branch of the Evangelical Protestant church.

But what is it that Paul admonishes Christians to do? Watchfully and manfully to stand fast in the faith. Then

#### *There is a Faith,*

that is a system of faith, something which Christians, as Christians, are to believe. It may be made up of facts, or of doctrines, or of both as closely and inseparably connected. It is not only *a faith*, but *the faith*. It is a fact or a doctrine, or facts and doctrines related to each other which distinctively mark Christianity, which are essential to it. It is *the faith* not of Judaism, not of heathenism, but of Christianity.



This much, then, is clear. There is such a faith, and one so well defined as to all essential matters, that it can be properly called *the faith*. So Paul declares. And he declares it as by inspiration. The Holy Ghost says so by the mouth and pen of Paul. Peter says the same thing, and by the same authority. Jude affirms the same thing, and also by inspiration, when he speaks of "the faith once delivered to the saints." They all say it; all the Apostles, we mean in effect, and all act upon the truth of the assertion. They can be seen everywhere, and at all times, preaching with one accord the same faith, and doing all in their power to have it spread throughout the world.

*It may be Known.*

And it may be known by *all* Christians. How else could they be told to stand on it, or in it. To stand in it, they must know where it is, and be able to distinguish it from other things which are not *the faith*, on which they might be tempted to plant their feet or place their confidence. The faith like diamonds and gold, has many counterfeits. Each one of these claims to be the genuine article. And some of them are so like the genuine, that if it were possible "the very elect would be deceived."

There must, then, be some way of knowing the faith. There must be some rule for "trying the spirits." And this must be a way in which "the wayfaring man, though a fool," that is, the least learned Christian pilgrim, need not err. It is assumed to be a rule which every follower of *the faith* of Jesus Christ may apply.

Where it may be found, and how it may be found, are questions which need not be answered now. They have often been answered, and our readers know the answer.

The main point at present is, that "*the faith*" to which Paul refers, may be known and, indeed, *is known* by all true Christians. It is taken for granted that the Corinthians knew it, and they were no better able to know it, had no better means of knowing it, than Christians have now.

*It Furnishes a Solid Footing.*

It is something which can be stood upon. This is plainly implied in the words. It is required, also, by the necessities of the case. Paul would not exhort or command men to stand on nothing, or

to stand on what offered no proper ground or basis to stand on. He would not ask Christians to stand in mud and mire, on quicksands, or ever rolling waves of the sea. Christians have earnest work to do, and need a firm footing. They have a race to run, and burdens to bear whilst they are running it, and need solid ground. They have a warfare to fight, and require a good standing place. They cannot work, run, or fight as they should and must, if the ground is all the while giving way beneath them, and keeping them busy with efforts barely to hold their feet.

The Gospel faith, that which Jesus taught and the Apostles preached, furnishes such a footing. It is a firm foundation of solid rock. There is no other like it, man can add nothing to it to increase its solidity or strength. That faith is the Word of the Lord, His Word in Jesus Christ. There is nothing on earth so sure. In Jesus Christ it is "*yea and amen*," and there is nothing under the whole heavens so firm as God's *Amen*. Men may sometimes think there is, but such men are mistaken; and "when the rain comes, and the winds blow and beat upon their house," they will find themselves most sadly mistaken. Their house, however beautiful in their own eyes, however "*organically*" built on "*the sand*" of their vain speculations, and however logically and philosophically it may be put together, will "*fall, and great will be the fall thereof*." Then they may weep and wail under the ruins; it will not help them. Their grand palace is fallen, "*for it was built upon the sand*."

Not such a foundation is *the faith*. He that furnished it, foresaw that rains would come, and storms would rage, and provided for the day of trial something that would endure. That which He has provided, is *the faith*. "*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but His word shall not pass away*." Man's schemes and theories of truth shall pass away, his sand-bottomed conceits, his cobweb logic, his puffed up profundities, but "*the faith*" shall endure for ever. Wherefore,

#### *Stand Fast*

in that faith. Stand fast in it as something real, and known to be real; not as something yet to become, or yet to be discovered. Be assured that it is not simply real in the sense of having actual existence somewhere, if only some one would find it, or put you in some sure way of probably finding it by and by. "*The word*

of faith is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart." Plant yourself firmly on it; lay confidently hold of it.

Stand fast in it by *becoming more fully acquainted with it, by learning to know what it is more thoroughly every day.* Here, if no where else, "knowledge is power;" that is, true knowledge, such as is learned from Jesus Christ our Prophet, and leads the true disciple better to know Him, and the truth in Him. Let no one laugh or frown you out of this, as though such knowledge were mere rationalism. Paul was no rationalist, and yet he prayed unceasingly, and with fervent desire that the Colossians might be "filled with the knowledge of Christ's will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding," (see Col. 1: 9; 13). The best means of gaining this knowledge, is by a prayerful and meek study of the Scriptures, in private and public. They set forth "the faith," and from them, as the *written Word of Christ*, we can learn what belongs to that faith, and what does not belong to it.

With the growth of such knowledge the Christian becomes more firmly rooted and grounded in the faith, as a whole, and in each particular doctrine or article of that faith. This increases his confidence in it, deepens his convictions of its truth, and fixes his mind more intelligently and surely on it.

*Stand fast in the faith by loving it more.* It must be not only the faith of the understanding, but of the heart. If our growing knowledge of it is of the right kind, it will lead us to lay warmer hold of it with our affections. The faith of the Gospel is not merely for the enlightening of the mind, but for the purifying of the heart. It offers to us not merely facts and truths to be thought on, but still more God the Redeemer to be loved. And the more we love that which this faith presents to us and gives us, the more closely will we cleave to it and the more resolutely will we stand by it.

Stand fast *by resisting all temptations to forsake it.* Let no influence of man tempt you to let go your hold of it, or to shake off its hold upon you. Efforts may be made to draw or to drive you away from it. Those efforts may be very indirectly and insidiously made. The faith may not be openly assailed. You may not be asked right out to renounce it. Such a plan would hardly succeed. Instead of open opposition, there will rather be secret undermining. Errors will be taught under the cover and name of the truth. They will, perhaps, claim to be the old truth or faith, only



somewhat more fully developed and improved by the development. Beware of such devices. Give no ear to the plausible developments. Tell them, if your new way of stating things means substantially the same as the old, we would gain nothing by the change; if it does not mean the same thing, we do not want it.

*Some Reasons for Standing Fast.*

1. It is a *good faith*. By it "good tidings of good" have been brought to a lost world. It reveals "a good Father in heaven." It reveals Jesus as "the Good Shepherd that gave His life for the sheep." It reveals the Holy Ghost as "the good Spirit of grace." It points out "the good way."

2. It is commended as a "precious faith." It was procured for man, as to the matter and substance of it, at an immense price. All who have ever tried it have found it precious; radiant with precious truth; overflowing with precious truth; a living fountain of precious consolation; an exhaustless treasure of "exceeding great and precious promises." Who would exchange it for what the wealth or wit of man can offer?

3. It is an old, tried faith. Nearly two thousand years ago it was given to the saints, and they have clung to it ever since. Often have the "gates of hell" rushed against it, but it has withstood the shock, and ever will any similar assaults. No weapon formed against it can prosper.

4. It is a sure and an enduring faith. The wisdom of men has often failed. The philosophies of the schools have shot like meteors across the sky, and successively sunk into utter darkness. But this faith, like the sun in the heavens, shines as brightly to-day as when its light first illumined the darkness of a benighted world.

5. It is the only faith which can be known as certainly and undoubted true. He who uttered and proclaimed it, spake with authority, and not as the scribes. And speaking by the mouth of Paul, His Spirit says, that if Paul or an angel from heaven should preach any other, he should be anathema, that is, accursed.

6. Hence, finally, we should stand fast in this faith, because God Himself has given it. He, assuredly, knew what was true. He, assuredly, knew how to reveal it. And He has commanded us to stand fast in it. Wherefore, stand fast, clad in the whole

*The Russians and the Russo-Greek Church.* 613

armor of God; "above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked; and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God."

---

THE RUSSIANS AND THE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

BY REV. N. C. BURT, D.D.

DRESDEN, August 1st, 1873.

Two visits to Jerusalem in Springtime had made me quite familiar with the garb and manner of Russian pilgrims, yet never until this Summer have I set foot upon the soil of Russia. Just now I have returned from a somewhat extensive run through the domains of the Czar, (Tsar, they spell the title now-a-days,) and among the observations I have been permitted to make, none have interested me more than just those which show that the annual pilgrimage to Jerusalem of multitudes of Russians, is not an isolated fact in the life of a great people—the promptings of a sectarian fanaticism—but the expression of a striking and profound national characteristic. The Russian people are a surprisingly devout and religious people. They are also true to their old nomadic character, and disposed to travel. It required of old the institution of serfage to keep them sufficiently connected with the soil to secure its cultivation. Put the two things together, the strong religious promptings and the unsubdued instinct of travel, and we have the result of Russian pilgrimages; pilgrimages to multitudes of shrines in Russia itself, and above all pilgrimages to the first seats of Christianity, to the spot of the Nativity, and to the Sepulchre of our Lord, with its Easter holy fire.

Shortly before visiting Russia. I read Mr. Hepworth Dixon's recent book on that country. So much of this book is occupied with an account of monasteries and monastic life, and of various strange religious phenomena, that I at once began to compare it with his "New America," and to regard "Free Russia" as a collection of Russian religious monstrosities. Yet my visit to Russia convinced me, that while Dixon's book may be in some things partial and extreme, it is correct in giving supreme place

to the religious features of Russian life, and that the tendencies which he portrays are not exceptional or abnormal, but general and natural.

While the Russians are a most devout people, the Protestant visitor cannot but regard them as in all things (in the usual sense of the word) too superstitious. A great part of their religion consists in bowing and making the sign of the Cross. In passing any church or other hallowed spot, the Russian removes his hat, bows and crosses himself twice. Moscow is a sacred city of the Russians. Its churches outnumber those of Rome, and its church bells exceed computation. At every convenient place, too, there is a picture of the Virgin, or other sacred emblem, with a lamp burning before it. The consequence is, that the promenaders on the streets, and the droskey drivers in their boxes, are kept in bending motion like so many wood-sawyers. Even drunken men, holding to one another for support, manage to get off their hats and give their bodies an extra twist as they stagger past the churches!

The Russian church encourages the veneration of its saints. The churches of Moscow contain the tombs of a number of the canonized. The story of St. Philip, the Archbishop of Moscow, who resisted John the Terrible, is of thrilling interest, and the tomb of this saint is greatly venerated. They lifted the lid of his silver coffin and showed us his mummied body. And we were told that the Emperor never visits Moscow without coming and performing his devotions at this tomb, and kissing the mummied forehead of the heroic old prelate.

Perhaps the most unique church building in the world, is that of St. Basil, in Moscow, familiar, no doubt, through pictures, to many of my readers who have never seen it. Of octagon shape, it contains no audience-room of any size, but is cut into eleven chapels, each furnished with a sumptuous altar and decorated screen, and all the appliances of worship. Outside, there is a tall central spire, surrounded by ten bulbous belfries with lower spires. This church was built by John the Terrible, over the remains of St. Basil. The story of this saint represents him as an idiot, who went naked winter and summer, but who had the power of working miracles, and exercised this power upon many persons. So he was canonized, his remains were placed in a silver coffin, and this gorgeous church was erected to hold them and perpetuate his



memory. Upon visiting his tomb we observed upon it two rusty chains, and were told that these were once worn by the saint. We had no thought that they were still put to any practical use, but were presently enlightened. For, having passed the tomb, and being for a little while in the remote end of the chapel, suddenly behind us there broke forth a prayer and chant. Returning, we found a small company of women gathered at the tomb, one sickly looking, standing forward with one of the chains of St. Basil hanging around her, an aged priest close beside the tomb and extending his arms over it as he uttered the prayers, and behind him two young priests who chanted responses to the prayers, in rich sonorous voices. Evidently, the canonized idiot was undergoing a powerful intercession in favor of the sick woman.

Although the Russian church does not tolerate the worship of images, it uses pictures with abundant freedom; and these are not merely of the stiff Byzantine type found in the Greek church proper, but beautiful paintings with graceful, flowing lines. Pictures of the Virgin are specially venerated, and almost every prominent church at Moscow or St. Petersburg possesses, among its choicest treasures, a miracle-working (?) picture of the Virgin.

The Cathedral of our Lady of Kazan is, next to St. Isaac's, the most splendid church in St. Petersburg. This church was built for the reception of the picture of the Virgin found at Kazan, and this picture, adorned with all manner of precious stones, receives the constant and almost passionate devotions of the people. At all hours of the day, men and women and children may be found before it bowing, crossing themselves, kissing it, and muttering prayers. The Emperor comes and kisses this picture the last thing on leaving the city, and the first on returning to it. His majesty was absent at the time of our recent visit, and we were told that when he should reach St. Petersburg on his return, he would pass directly from the train to the Kazan church, pray before the picture, kiss it—then go to his palace.

The Cathedral of St. Isaac's also possesses a picture of the Virgin, which in former days was discovered to have the power of working miracles. The anniversary of this discovery occurred while we were in St. Petersburg, and we witnessed the pompous solemnities with which the event was celebrated. These were presided over by the Archbishop in person, who was enrobed and crowned for the occasion, in the presence of the people, under

the central dome of the church—he being assisted in the services by a brace of bishops, and a full force of the lower clergy, besides the choir of the church, numbering sixty men and boys. Meanwhile, the light of a hundred wax tapers was flashing on the bejeweled picture, and a constant succession of worshipers filed rapidly past it, with bows and kisses.

There are those who believe in the possibility of reformation within the bosom of the Roman Catholic church. Among the greatest obstacles to such a reformation are the Papacy, the Order of the Jesuits, and a celibate priesthood. The Greek church has no Pope, and no order of the Jesuits, and it permits its parish priests to marry. Why, then, is not a reformation within the bosom of the Greek church quite hopeful? Yet its hierarchy is a compact body, possessing great political power, and keenly jealous of its privileges. This body recruits itself wholly from the "black clergy"—the monks, who are even more numerous and possess more of an *esprit de corps* than those of the Romish church. At the same time, the parish priests are deplorably ignorant—beyond anything known in the Romish church, and the people are sunk in gross superstition.

Of the intolerance of the Russian church toward other communions, the world has been a witness within the last few years. And while Prince Gortschakoff protested to the committee of the Evangelical Alliance, that the Russian government was kindly disposed toward dissenting churches actually existing in Russia, he at the same time, I believe, avowed, what at any rate is true—that the laws of Russia strictly forbid and punish all proselyting from the established church.

Mr. Dixon has much to say of dissent in Russia, and reckons the number of dissenters at one-half the population. From the little inquiry I was able to make, this estimate appeared to me greatly exaggerated.—*New York Evangelist*.

---

I HATE anything that occupies more space than it is worth. I hate to see a load of bandboxes go along the street, and I hate to see a parcel of big words without anything in them.—*Haslit*.

# WHAT IS IT?

THEY say it is not *pantheism*. They indignantly repel the charge that it is pantheistic. They declare it "absurd" to impute such a sentiment to them or their language. They denounce the statements made of their theory as "a caricature." If their theory has been at all caricatured, it was undesigned. It was also unnecessary. A caricature is meant to make a thing appear ridiculous. But the severest caricature of this Lancaster theory, is to exhibit it in its own terms and features. This has been done.

Dr. Dorner has charged their system with a pantheistic element. Dr. Hodge, noticing in an incidental way the utterances of the founders of their school, had previously, in his lectures, classed them with a modern pantheising party. They have generally been considered as blameable with this error. In the MONTHLY their own words have been literally quoted, and have been found plainly to justify the accusation.

And yet they stand forth, and as with injured innocence cry out, that they are misrepresented and grossly wronged. Like the German pantheist, Hegel, there seems to be but one person who understands them, and they are not sure that he does so fully. Do they understand themselves? Facts indicate that even this is doubtful. We shall see.

They also hint that their opponents do not know what pantheism is. This may be so. It is a queer thing, this pantheism, especially in some of those who hold it, and yet do not want to be called or thought pantheistic.

Does this seem to imply that, possibly, it is themselves who do not know what they are holding and teaching? We should be glad to think so. Charity prompts us to think so. Then they would be guilty of the mischief they are doing "ignorantly, through unbelief." This would not be as bad as to do it with a full knowledge of what they are about.

But how is this matter to be decided? If their theory and teaching in regard to the relation of the Creator and His creation, and especially in regard to God in Christ and redemption, is not pantheistic, *what is it?*

## *How is the Point to be Decided?*

Just as similar matters of difference of opinion are decided.



The evidence in the case must be examined. Their own statements, declarations, phraseology—everything they may have written and published, or otherwise made known, which has a fair bearing on the subject, is to be duly considered, and taken as proof of what their theory or doctrine is.

Such statements or declarations of theirs must of course be taken in a true, fair sense, and be judged by fixed laws of interpretation. *We* may not take and explain them to suit any possible, private purpose, and thus, perhaps, put a wrong sense in them. But neither may *they* say, plainly and clearly one thing, and then when called to a reckoning turn around and declare they meant something else. A man cannot teach Pelagianism, and yet deny that he is a Pelagian. A man cannot hold and defend the language, terms, expressions, and doctrine of Arius, and yet claim to be considered a sound Athanasian.

Both Pelagius and Arius claimed to be soundly evangelical. Were they so because they may have thought they were, and wished to pass as orthodox with others?

If the Lancaster Faculty teaches and upholds a pantheistic doctrine concerning the relation of the Creator to the creature, then they are fairly chargeable with holding and favoring pantheism, let them deny it as vehemently as they please.

Let then

#### *Their own Portraiture*

of their theory or their own doctrine be taken, as the outlines of it are found in articles which have, at different times, been published by them. They surely cannot complain if they are taken at their own repeated and solemnly emphasized declarations. Here, then, is what they say.

"Religion to be real must be in some way *community* of life with God; \* \* \* an "*inward conjunction in a real way.*"

"Christ *united Himself with manhood in its deepest substance, organically*, as its head, so that it may be saved generically in Him." The incarnation was a "a union (of the Godhead in its substance, B.) with humanity, as an organic whole."

Again, the incarnation is declared to be "the incorporation of this higher element (that is, the substance of the Godhead in Christ, B.) into the actual onflowing life-stream of the world; \* \* \* a movement on the part of God in the bosom of humanity,

taking hold on the depths of our human (cosmic) existence in the most real historical way."

"Christianity is a *new order of life*, which is comprehended primarily in the person of Christ, and *which starts forth from Him as its original principle and root*."

"The word incarnate, is the root and origin of the entire new creation, no less fully than He is to be considered as being, before He became man, the producing cause of the old creation."

"The *organic* view of Christianity underlies the true idea of the church."

"The ultimate reason for the incarnation is to be sought \* \* in the necessity of the divine self-revelation *ad intra*, and in the relation of the second person of the Trinity *ad extra*, to all that He created and made."

"The two creations (that is the one described in Gen. 1, and the creation described in the new creation in Jesus Christ under the Gospel, B.) are exhibited as being throughout *organically joined together* in His person."

"Neither is there any room for doubt in regard to the law which should govern the *coalescence* of the two orders of existence into one. \* \* Their must be for this purpose a flowing into it (that is into the lower natural life of man, B.) of spirit and life from a higher sphere (in an organic way, B.). Only in and by the powers of the heavenly world itself, only *through real conjunction* with those powers proceeding forth as they do from the Lord of life and glory, is it possible to *conceive rationally* of the glorification of the natural in man by means of the spiritual. The case requires and involves thus in the end an *actual coming together of nature and the supernatural, of the human and the divine*, to make the idea of humanity and the world complete."

"That life-breath which God breathed forth into Adam when he became a living soul, *cannot be regarded otherwise than as an emanation from the being of God*."

"The life of regeneration is *an emanation by the Holy Ghost, from Christ's divine human life*."

"The *life of the parent is transmitted* by ordinary generation to the child, and transmitted without any dimunition of life on the side of the parent. \* \* Life begets life. \* \* Now, in this way *we have an analogy in the natural order of what takes place in the glorified order*."

*What does all this Mean?*

With these quotations we pause. They have been arranged with double regard to logical and chronological order, as far as the two could be combined. In selecting and presenting them, the strictest regard has been paid to truth and fairness. Of course they had to be cited in detached sentences and assertions. Space would not allow more. But they are in no sense "garbled extracts," taken from a connection which would give them a different import from that which they bear as quoted. They are believed truly to exhibit the theory and views of the school (Lancaster-Mercersburg) from whose writings they have been taken.

As an observant reader will perceive, they show a gradually bolder development in the mode of stating the theory and doctrine they involve and teach. At first the words or terms employed are such as would not be readily understood by the ordinary reader, such as an "inward conjunction" of the Godhead with humanity; God in Christ "joining Himself *objectively* with the life of the world; "the two creations *organically joined together* in Christ's person;" "an organic life-process," &c. Such phrases and terms might be regarded as meaning this or that, or as merely a very profound philosophical way of stating things. And it is probable that most of those who have read the articles containing such terms and phrases, have so regarded them. But as we follow up the matter, the language is found to be more outspoken, or at least more plain, until at last the emboldened disciples come right out and express themselves in the palpable pantheism of the last three quotations.

The last one is especially significant. It is taken from a very recent article by a member of the Theological Faculty at Lancaster. This article was called forth by our criticism of Mr. Rupp's doctrine of regeneration by baptism, as endorsed by the Lancaster Faculty. It is intended as a defense and explanation of the assertion of Mr. R. (quoted above), that the soul of Adam was an *emanation from the being* (that is, the substance of the life) *of God*, and that in regeneration a life-substance emanated to the regenerated person from the divine-human life of Christ. This we pronounced pantheistic.

Thereupon the Lancaster Faculty, in vindication of Mr. R., employs and applies the illustration or analogy quoted above.



Taking it now in connection with all the other citations, and as a labored, well-considered explanation of what the school holds and teaches, what does it all plainly mean?

They say that natural generation, as between parents and children, furnishes an analogy to the relation between God, as the creator, and the creature, especially man, and in the new creation. As parents naturally beget natural children, so God in Christ begets, supernaturally, His spiritual children. In both cases life and a life-substance, according to their kind, are transmitted, emanated. That is, in the second case, God causes His own life-substance, as God, to pass over organically into organic conjunction with humanity, with each individual subject of this regenerative process, and in this way reproduces His own substantial divine life in them. What is this but an attempt to Christianize pantheism?

It is said we do not know what pantheism is, if we call this pantheism. Does Dr. Dorner know what pantheism is? And yet he said, before Lancaster had ventured to come out quite so plumply, that its theory "involved something pantheistic," as well as *Romish*.

Does *Dr. Gans* (in Herzog's Encyclopedia) know what pantheism is? And yet *his definition of it exactly covers the Lancaster theory as we have exhibited it*. (See Art. *Pantheism*, p. 76, above, German edition).

Any theory which teaches that the creature, whether as the natural man or as the renewed man, is the product of, or an emanation from, the substantial life of the Creator, or is the result of an organic conjunction of the substance of the Godhead with the substance of man thus pervading it, and raising it up into such a vital organic oneness with God, is pantheistic.

And any theory which teaches that God, by supernatural means, begets children, creatures, out of His own God-substance, just as earthly parents beget children naturally out of their physical substance, is pantheistic.

This the Lancaster Faculty not only does, but vindicate themselves in doing.

It is of no avail for them to try to cover the bad point in the theory thus advanced and advocated, by holding up to ridicule our phrase, "A *portion* of the substance of God," as involving an absurdity. That modified way of stating their view, was not

adopted inadvertently. We knew that Mr. R. had not said "*portion*;" but in very charity we were willing to think he meant that. It was hardly thought possible that he intended to teach that God emptied His *whole substance* out into creation. Since, however, they spurn our charitable attempt somewhat to soften down their absurd doctrine, let them have it their own way.

Again: An effort is made, we do not say designedly, to confuse the argument by showing that *life* may be communicated, or may emanate, without loss to the substantial centre of its own being, &c. This the writer of the article from which we last quoted above, attempts to illustrate physiologically. (His illustration, unhappily, is in direct contradiction of physiological laws; but we let that pass). What he thus attempts, however, is not to the point. Whether the God-substance loses anything by the emanation, or does not lose anything, but remains as full in itself as before, does not lessen the pantheistic character of the theory.

Call it, then, what they please—any sober, intelligent mind, viewing the theory as we have exhibited it in their own statements and illustrations, must answer the question of this article by saying: *that is pantheism*.

The advocates of the theory may not know it; they may not mean it. So Elisha's disciples did not know that they had gathered poisonous gourds for their pottage; they did not mean any harm by what they did; still the wild gourds were "death in the pot."

It is no part of our present purpose to expose the errors of this pantheistic theory, to prove it not only false, but really unphilosophical and shallow, notwithstanding its pretensions, or to show that it is necessarily subversive of every fundamental doctrine of Evangelical Christianity, including those of sin, redemption, as taught in the Gospel, justification by faith, &c. It is evident, recently, that the Faculty at Lancaster feel all this. Our present aim was simply to prove it pantheistic from their own lips. This we have done, and so for the present stop.

---

It has been computed that were all the energy exerted during twenty-four hours by the heart, in propelling the blood, to be condensed into a single effort, it would have power enough to throw a ton of iron 120 feet into the air.

## NOT TO THE POINT.

IN a recent article on "Historical Development," from the pen of Dr. Gerhart, or Dr. T. G. Apple, some very good things and true are said, with which every intelligent reader could hardly fail but be pleased. They may have been thought inconsistent with some other things heretofore issuing from the same source on the same subject. But inconsistency is commendable when it serves the cause of truth.

The writer of the article does, indeed, commit some errors of statement inadvertently. Thus he does not correctly present the false Romish view of the matter, failing to set forth its worst features. He likewise errs in stating what he calls "the view entertained by many Protestants," by ascribing to them what it would be impossible to prove they hold.

These mistakes may be explained probably by the fact that the writer was so intent upon the *main purpose* of his article, that such incidental and comparatively trivial things were not duly considered. That purpose seems to have been to vindicate the theory of his school regarding historical development against some serious objections to it. That the theory needed to be defended, in several important respects, must be admitted by all who know it, and have seen its practical operations and effects.

Written for this purpose, the article contains, as said, many good things. This, we say, not on the authority of our private judgment only, but because much of what is said is in full accordance with the views which have always been entertained and held by all intelligent advocates of Evangelical Christianity in ancient and modern times. Of this the writer of the article appears not to have been aware. We can assure him, however, that it is a fact. And he can verify our assertion by examining the most primitive and credible records of Christianity, as well as by turning to the writings of such Reformers as Zwingli, Calvin, and even Ursinus himself, or to the more recent works of Neander, Hagenbach, Shedd, Hodge, and scores of other Reformed theologians. In this respect his theory of development, *as illustrated in this article*, is no advance upon views which have always prevailed in Evangelical Christianity.

For instance, the *bearing* of the true theory, and also of false theories, of historical development *upon theology*, has been always



quite fully understood and deeply felt. At least this has been well understood outside of the school which the writer of the article represents.

No one whose opinions have had much influence, has ever denied that there is such a thing as historical development or a progressively clearer apprehension of Christian doctrines and matters pertaining to the Christian life. No one has ever found fault with any party or school for maintaining that "the Reformed Confessions and Commentaries on them, cannot (and, we add, should not) be lifted up out of the 16th century and set down in the 19th; without reference to the progress of theological thought during the intervening period. No one has ever blamed any school, or the Faculty of any theological seminary, for holding it to be "impossible to look through the same spectacles now that the theologians of three hundred years ago looked through;" or at any rate to do so with the same eyes, which is probably what the writer meant. Still less, we may add, should any of the present age be expected or required to make such use of the spectacles of a Cyprian and theologians of his generation, *fifteen* hundred years ago.

And, finally, no one has ever held or taught that Christianity is not "a life unfolding itself from Christ as its source," in a true gospel sense; and no Protestant theologian has ever advocated a bondage of mind and of heart to "dead forms and formulas."

Of course our Lancaster friends will be glad to learn these facts, and to accept them as a pleasant relief to their minds in regard to this important matter. The service is cheerfully rendered, and subsequent articles, which may issue from the same source, may be expected to show a due appreciation of the service.

But remembering the main purpose of the article now under notice, we must say that whilst it contains, as admitted, many very good things, they *do not seem to us to be at all to the point for the writer's purpose*. According to that purpose he should, as we think, have stated and defended the *peculiar* features of the historical development-theory of his school. This he has not even attempted. He mentions mainly such things as no one disputes, and entirely passes over what has been found fault with and condemned.

#### *Peculiarities Unnoticed.*

What are some of the distinctive peculiarities of the Mercers-

burg-Lancaster theory of historical development which specially need vindication, or something else?

1. One of the first and most marked has been, that its theory is not *progressive*, but *retrogressive*; it did not begin by going forward, but by *going backward*.

It has often been asserted and shown, that whilst Mercersburg theology was a *new thing* for our church, it was in reality not new in its leading points, but a revival of old errors, and an attempt to have them introduced into the church in the place of its old historical faith. This is manifest from the tenor of its articles on early Christianity—by which it meant the Christianity of the third and fourth centuries, etc.—on Cyprian, etc. It is proven, also, by its zeal to have the third, fourth and fifth century sense of the Creed revived and restored to full authority over against what it rather contemptuously calls the sixteenth-century sense. By doing this the school has in fact broken away from, and ignored what is, generally considered as the principle of historical development, leaped back from, say, 1850, over fifteen centuries, including the Reformation period, and linked its chain with Cyprian's and that of his times.

For doing this very thing, Dr. Dorner applied to it the expressive term, *repristination*, in his tract of 1868; and in his recent paper before the Evangelical Alliance he uses similar phraseology with evident reference to the same matter.

Now, this is a point which greatly needs clearing up. Can theology develop backward in this way, and yet claim to be a true historical development? Can it contemptuously cast away "the spectacles of the sixteenth century," as wholly unsuited to the keen vision of our age, and yet insist on looking through the smoked and blistered goggles of the fourth or fifth? *This is the point* to be demonstrated.

2. But there is another equally marked peculiarity in this very remarkable theory of historical development. It comes to view in the actual application of the theory to particular doctrines. Let us take two or three illustrations.

Here is the doctrine concerning the purpose of the incarnation of God the Son. Evangelical Protestant theology for three centuries has, with one heart and voice declared, that this took place in order that in the human nature thus united with the divine nature, an atonement might be made for sin, and redemption be

provided for sinners. Hence the atoning death of Jesus upon the cross is declared most emphatically to be "the ground and foundation of our salvation."

Now, mark how our Lancaster theology *develops* this old Reformed and older apostolic doctrine. It plumply rejects it, denying its truth. It sets it wholly aside as false. In its stead it places quite different doctrine—different specifically, and different generically. That theology teaches that the great purpose of the incarnation was *not* what it has been held to be for three hundred years, and a great deal longer, *but* that the purpose was thereby to effect "an organic conjunction of the Godhead with humanity," as fallen, in order thereby to redeem it. It teaches, further, that the ground and foundation of our salvation is not the atoning death of Christ, but that it is to be sought and found in his incarnation. Whether this is a better doctrine and more scriptural than the old Reformed doctrine, is a question which need not be raised or considered here. The point is, is this latter doctrine in any true sense a development of the former? Does it legitimately grow out of the former? In common with many others, we affirm that it does not. The two start from radically different principles, and involve consequences which can not be reconciled with each other. They do not only differ in appearance, and in their mode of statement—as, for instance, an oak tree differs from an acorn, or a cluster of grapes from the stock of the vine—but they differ as a vine with its clusters differs from the hawthorn and its berries, which may grow by the side of the vine, or as a laurel differs from the oak.

What is needed, therefore, in this case, from our Lancaster friends, is not a pleasant article on historical development and its important bearings on theology, *but* a plain, direct defense of this way of developing historical development. Possibly, they can defend it and show it to be quite legitimate and right. But certainly they have never yet done it. What they have written thus far on the subject is *not to the point*.

As another illustration of the subject in hand, take the doctrine of the *sacraments*. That the Reformed church has always held views of the sacraments in general, and of baptism and the Lord's Supper in particular, *differing* not only from Romish, but from Lutheran views, must be admitted. This difference involves principles. It springs from and rests in a view of the person of Christ,



of redemption, and of the application of redemption to individuals, which in a definite way distinguishes the Reformed church. About this there can be no dispute. What the Reformed doctrine of the sacraments is, and the grounds on which it rests, are well known. They have been held, taught, and confessed for three hundred years.

Now no sensible person will demand, or ever has demanded, that the theology of the present day shall be held slavishly bound to the particular *forms* of language, or statement in which the Reformed doctrine was set forth and expounded in the 16th century. Nobody insists that Reformed theologians now shall look at the doctrine only through the spectacles used then. Though it would not hurt some of them if they did this occasionally, merely by way of a wholesome variety from their habit of looking through much older spectacles or even so dogmatically through their own.

On the contrary, ample room for development, for progress of thought and apprehension, are allowed and encouraged. In our church, especially, this has always been allowed and practiced. Proofs of this fact are at this moment within arms reach of us. Besides the Commentary of Ursinus on the Catechism, we have the very excellent practical one of *Christophe Stahelin* (1774). This, as its date shows, was not written under the influence of later Rationalism. Neither do we find in it any of "the tracks of the scholastic philosophy which (is said to have) prevailed at the time of the Reformation." The reader of it has not "to wade through dry syllogistic forms" in perusing it. In every such respect the author felt free to develop his views in his own way. And he did it very well. But he seems to have known how to do it as a Reformed theologian, and *in harmony with Reformed principles*. His exposition of the Catechism shows genuine and legitimate development.

Next we have the shorter, outline exposition of *J. P. Kindler* (1846). In this, likewise, the author adopts his own method, uses freely his own *forms* of expression, not "dry or syllogistic." But throughout his views are essentially consistent with the Reformed faith.

Then we have the valuable series of sermons on the Catechism preached during the Tercentenary year (1863) of the Heidelberg Catechism by more than forty different European theologians,

including seven of the *Krummacher* family. Here, we may say, is a harp with forty strings. Each string gives its own peculiar note. But all are in perfect accord with each other, and with the principle of Reformed harmony on which the harp is constructed. There is real unity in the formal diversity, and the minds and hearts of the forty preachers show no marks of having been hampered by "scholastic forms," or bound by slavish chains. They could with one accord oppose and denounce every thing Popish, teach and maintain true Reformed doctrines, and yet freely develop those doctrines in their own way.

In addition to these we have *Herman Dalton's Immanuel* (1869), a volume of eloquent and most intensely earnest and edifying sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism, delivered to his congregation in St. Petersburg. Here, too, there is freedom, development, progress; but, as in the other cases, it is forward and upward, not backward and downward.

And, finally, we have the "Exercises on the Heidelberg Catechism, by S. R. Fisher, D.D.," an excellent book for its purpose, and one which serves further to illustrate *our* point.

For, surely all this proves that the Reformed church has always maintained and practiced the principle of a genuine historical progress and development in the *formal* exhibition as well as apprehension of the truth.

Whilst, however, this has been done, it has been no less firmly maintained that progress and development in matters of faith *must be consistent with that faith. This principle or law*, our Lancaster (formerly Mercersburg) theologians *virtually and practically*, if not in form, *deny*. According to *their* theory and practice of "historical development, in its bearings on theology," a party of theologians may rise up in a church, and so *bear down* on its historical faith as to sweep it all away. Not only may the dry scholastic scaffolding used in building it up be demolished, but the very foundation may be torn up and the "precious stones" of that foundation be undermined, prized out of their place, and cast aside. Not merely may the "old spectacles" be discarded as unfit for modern eyes, but the *old objects of faith*, in their true character, as most authoritatively and plainly set before us, may be abolished, and wholly different ones be put in their place.

Allowing ourselves also to use similitudes, a process of development like this is very much as if a party should propose to im-

prove Lebanon and its cedars, by uprooting the cedars and planting scrub-oaks in their place. Or it might be compared to the development of a vineyard, by cutting down the vines and turning it into "a garden of cucumbers."

Just here it is that the Mercersburg-Lancaster theology makes one of its grave mistakes. It confounds development with *change*, and *motion* with progress. But any one can see even through 16th century spectacles, that to turn a living pine tree into charcoal, or ashes, though a great *change* as to the tree, is not developing the tree; or that to make idols out of the trunk of an oak, is a great *change* for the oak, but no legitimate development.

It would have been in point, therefore, for the writer of the article we are noticing, to vindicate this notable peculiarity of the development theory of his school. To show, for instance, that notwithstanding the radical difference of his doctrine of the sacraments, that doctrine was nevertheless a true outgrowth of the Reformed doctrine—that would have been to his purpose. Wholly overlooking that, however, what he does say in the article, is *not to the point*.

3. Nor is this all. Besides erring in making a backward movement, or a mere change, greater or less, to constitute historical development, the Lancaster theory as reduced to actual practice, shows another peculiarity. With a single exception, if it even is an exception, *its developments have been into views long held by the Romish or ultra-Lutheran church, and which the Reformed church has from the first most decidedly rejected as contrary to the scriptures and false.*

This is so remarkable a feature of the Lancaster notion and scheme of development, that its friends should not wonder that so many persons cannot see how such a process should be called progress, or how such a substitution of Romish and old Lutheran dogmas for Reformed doctrines should be called development.

Even Romanists themselves have noticed this peculiarity of the new-order theology, and have very naturally exulted over it. So have the Puseyites in the Episcopal church, and Lutherans. Our readers will remember how Prof. Fritschel, of Iowa, rejoiced over the conversion of what he called Nevinism to Lutheranism, on the subject of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper even, to a great extent.

The fact is that the Lancaster theory of the sacraments, of the



church, of ordination, and of the ministry as a priestly order, of absolution, &c., &c.—in a word, all that is distinctive of that school, is virtually either Romish, or ultra-Lutheran, or both. To adopt that theory, therefore, would be in effect to turn the Reformed church into a Romish or old Lutheran church, or a sort of hybrid mixture of the two. What if the *name* Reformed should still be retained? If the true Reformed faith and life are gone, let the name go, too.

Here, then, again, is something really entitled to attention, upon which the writer of the article we are noticing, should have laid out his strength. He should have tried to show that a Reformed theology may, by legitimate historical development, develop into an ultra-Lutheran or Romish theology. He should by fair logical demonstration have proven that his school may, consistently with loyalty to the Reformed faith, develop ministers trained there into high-church Episcopalians and Papists. This, clearly, is what he needed to do as an apologist for his school and its theology. Failing to do this, he evidently missed the mark, and spent his strength without coming to the point.

As any one can see, other illustrations of the matter in hand might very easily be given. But the above will answer, at least for the present.

Two or three smaller items, incidentally named in his article, may be touched in conclusion.

Unhappily for himself, and for the consistency of his school, he disparages the commentary of Ursinus as "*second-hand*," and therefore, of course, less worthy of confidence and respect. Why does he indulge in such a depreciation of that Commentary? And how can he reconcile it with what the founder of his school says about that Commentary, as coming down to us under a "*properly authentic form*," and as entitled to "*more weight than any other exposition of the true meaning of the Catechism*?"

Again. How unfortunate is his allusion to *Dörner*, especially just after that distinguished theologian had renewedly denounced the "*duodecimo Popedom*" theory of ritualistic, sacerdotal high-churchism, as "*a foul stream which now flows through the evangelical church of more than one land*?" Do the Lancaster writers suppose that people did not know what Dr. Dörner meant?

Finally, when our Lancaster friend says: "*doctrines* are not stationary or fixed," he must allow us most emphatically to differ

from him, as making an assertion utterly at variance with any truly philosophical theory of development, as boldly contradictory of the Scriptures, and as opening a floodgate to a Darwinian theology which, should it prevail, would drown in a fatal deluge "the faith once delivered to the saints."

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

---

THE OLD CATHOLIC MOVEMENT.

THERE is something very encouraging in the old Catholic movement as it is now progressing in Germany and Switzerland. We feel persuaded that it will prove itself to be an abiding movement, that will grow into greater proportions from year to year.

It started, it is well known, upon the promulgation of the Infallibility Dogma at Rome a few years ago. It is really a *Protestant movement*. It is a *protest* of the learning and conscience of a portion of the German Catholic church against the monstrous and corrupt, and corrupting dogma that the Pope, a mere man, must be held to be infallible in the decision of dogmatic questions. The Protestantism of the 16th century was a protest against the accumulated corruptions of ages. The Old Catholic movement of the 19th century is a protest against an additional corruption that is as bad as that of the idolatry of the mass; for this is in substance an idolatry of a man.

This movement had its period of preparation just as that of the 16th century had. It will be the task of later ages to search out and set in order the under currents that had for years been preparing the way for this outburst against the Jesuitism of the Roman Curia. So far as we can now judge, one main preparatory influence lay in the higher education of a portion of the Romanists in Germany, during the past fifty years, than was the case in other Catholic countries. In this period Protestant scholars and professors in the German universities were carrying forward their historical, dogmatic and exegetical labors with wonderful industry and perseverance. The Catholic universities in Germany, and the Catholic faculties in the mixed schools, were swept into this current of investigation and study; and it is known that they took

a very respectable stand in all departments of theological investigation. The Catholic professors and theologians of this period in Germany, stood far higher in point of learning than had been the case in the Catholic church in any preceding age or country.

It was from out of this circle of Catholic scholars, like Dollinger, Michaelis, Reinkens, that this movement arose and took shape. Dollinger, of the University of Munich, the chief Catholic university of Germany, had been the instructor of a very large portion of the Catholic priests. It was in its start essentially a protest of the Catholic scholarship of Germany against a dogma that could not stand the test of historical examination. But to this was added at once, also, a protest of the Christian conscience against a doctrine that set up an iron *authority* over and above the rights of the individual Christian man.

The movement of the 16th century did not spring so much from the circle of learned men, as from the subjective struggles of men burdened with guilt, and seeking after the true way of justification, which Roman corruptions had obscured, nay, blotted out altogether, in a great measure. It was, therefore, a much deeper movement, more wide-spread in its influence, and more thorough from the start.

Differing thus in their origin, it is interesting, however, to note how quickly the two movements fall pretty much into the same channels; how harmonious they are in their aims; how friendly the attitude between them from the start; and how they point toward the same goal. The Old Catholics are visibly approaching, day by day, more to the genuine Protestant stand-point.

It is interesting to note, even, how the new movement finds some of its centres of activity in precisely the same localities which the Reformation of the 16th century made historical and famous. *Now, as then*, it was mainly in its origin a German movement. As Luther's voice in Germany was the trumpet, so has been the voice of Dollinger in this case; only Luther was of Northern Germany, Dollinger of Southern. As Zurich and Geneva were the centres, very early, of great activity in the new cause—the former under Zwingli, the latter under Calvin—so now, also, these two historic cities are just at this time the centres of great excitement under Michaelis and Hyacinthe. The largest Catholic churches and parishes in the two cities, have elected these two men to be their ministers, and the Romish bishops have not been



able to prevent it. They have already introduced many reforms into actual practice.

This movement has now taken wide dimensions in Germany and Switzerland. They have a bishop (Reinkens, schismatically ordained, which does not seem to trouble them in the least), over a hundred regular congregations, and claim 200,000 adherents, and daily new members and priests are uniting with them.

From the start they have been exceedingly friendly to the Protestant churches. They have not seen Protestantism to be a failure, as some of our pseudo-Protestants have been persistently asserting. On the contrary, they have already adopted many of the fundamental doctrines and practices of the Protestant church, and more will follow when the proper time comes. They welcomed European and American Protestants to their conferences in Germany—welcomed them as brethren. They sent a very kind and fraternal letter to the Evangelical Alliance at New York (that *infidel* body, as one of our high-church writers termed it a few years ago). We cannot see that their movement has the slightest similarity with, or sympathy for, the Mercersburg movement in our church. All the precious doctrines of the Mercersburg faith; the plenary authority of the church; the priestly authority of the ministry; salvation through the assumption of generic humanity by Christ; the kaleidoscopic doctrine of development—have been essentially repudiated. We shall watch the progress of the movement with great interest and great hope. We think it will ultimately coalesce with, and fall into, the great Protestant movement.

J. H. G.

---

BAPTIST.—The Clarendon street Baptist Society, Boston, presented their pastor, Rev. A. J. Gordon, a check for \$1000 on the tenth anniversary of his marriage, a few days since.—A great sensation in ecclesiastical circles at Rome was created lately by the abandonment of Romanism by a Catholic priest, the Rev. Father Paolo Grassi, incumbent of the Basilica Santa Maria Maggiore. Having accepted the Baptist faith, his baptism in public, as may be imagined, created considerable excitement.

## Arsinus College Repertory.

---

### THE EARLIEST LANGUAGE.

IN Professor Max Müller's second lecture on Mr. Darwin's philosophy of language, he reproduces his theory, that human language begins with roots which always are "abstract terms" denoting "general concepts." "There is," he says, "in every language, a certain layer of words which may be called purely emotional. It is smaller or larger according to the genius and history of each nation, but it is never quite concealed by the later strata of rational speech. Most interjections, many imitative words, belong to this class. They are perfectly clear in their character and origin, and it could never be maintained that they rest on general concepts. But if we deduct that inorganic stratum, all the rest of language, whether among ourselves or among the lowest barbarians, can be traced back to roots, and every one of these roots is the sign of general concept. This is the most important discovery of the science of language.

"Take any word you like, trace it back historically to its most primitive form, and you will find that, besides the derivative elements, which can easily be separated, it contains a predicative root, and that in this predicative root rests the connotative power of the word. Why is a stable called a stable? Because it stands. Why is a saddle called a saddle? Because you sit in it. Why is a road called a road? Because we ride on it. Why is heaven called heaven? Because it is heaven on high. In this manner every word, not excluding the commonest terms that must occur in every language, the names for father, mother, brother, sister, hand and foot, etc., have been traced back historically to definite roots, and every one of these roots expresses a general concept. Unless, therefore, Mr. Darwin is prepared to maintain that there are languages which have no names for father, and mother, for heaven

and earth, or only such words for those objects as cannot be derived from predicative roots, his statement that there are languages without abstract terms, falls to the ground. Every root is an abstract term, and these roots, in their historical reality, mark a period in the history of the human mind—they mark the beginning of rational speech."

We accord most fully with Professor Müller, that the evolution of rational speech, from the expressions of feelings by brutes, as held by Mr. Darwin, is a groundless assumption. But we should be far from raising an objection to the Darwinian hypothesis on the ground urged by Professor Müller, that all language historically springs from roots, every one of which expresses a general concept. In the first place, this origin of human speech, in general terms, is as much an assumption as Darwin's evolution of language from animal ejaculations. It is entirely insusceptible of historic proof, of course; and the fact that many or most words may be conjecturally traced to a connection with roots which are generic or comprehensive in their meaning, furnishes no support for the supposition that the primitive words in human speech either were these roots or had any such generic meaning. Indeed, the theory is preposterous. It supposes that there were in the minds of the first speakers, before any speech, general ideas. Whence did they obtain these ideas? To suppose that the ideas were planted in the human mind as realities, as positive experiences by the Creator, implies a miraculous exertion of creative power as far beyond all human conception as beyond all historical testimony or scientific deduction. That the human mind should have general before single or particular ideas, is contradictory to all experience and to all linguistic facts. The mind ever begins with the particular. The general, in the order of genesis, is from the single and simple. Were two men, entirely unused to speech, to meet, we cannot doubt that their first words would stand for single objects or for single attributes demonstrable one by one and singly to the senses. To suppose that they would begin by using a root denoting general brightness and then apply it to the sun is, as we have said, preposterous. To hold that this use of generic roots is the first of language, is absurd; for it necessarily presupposes the existence of these root words as understood by both speaker and hearer. There is the ghost here of Prof. Müller's slaughtered ring theory of the origin of language. It is all unreal



and unphilosophical. It shows utter ignorance of the nature and origin of general concepts, which arise simply and only by the combination of single concepts. True, an original single concept is susceptible of analysis in the progress of thought; but primitively every comprehensive concept must be a simple concept, as every generic or extensive concept pre-supposes a single or individual concept. To assume this groundless and absurd hypothesis of the origin of language in generic terms as a premise from which to deduce the necessity of a period in the history of language which gave rise to these roots, and then to go on and give to this period the name of "The Radical Period," out-Darwins Darwin. It violates the teachings of linguistic science itself, which reveals the fact as a common one, that words denoting general attributes rise as naturally from individual terms as the reverse. The sentence before the last, exemplifies indeed this teaching, in the derivation of an attribute word from the proper name. So in regard to all these general roots to which Professor Müller claims all words can be traced, it is just as supposable and altogether more probable that the roots come from primitive subject-words. The word *lynching* can be traced with other paronyms to the root *lynch*; but *lynch* comes from a proper name.

Instead of being "the most important discovery of the science of language" that the primitive words were general terms, as Professor Müller claims, we hold the supposition as the wildest illusion, supported by no evidence and contradictory to common sense, to logic and to linguistic science. It implies, as we have stated, that before men spoke, they had general ideas, which are hardly possible in human experience, except through the instrumentality of language; it implies that the originators of language when they first met and first spoke, had each of them these abstract general root-words already in possession, and bearing the same meaning to each; it implies that predicates exist before subjects in thought and independently of them; it implies that all subject words spring from predicate words; and it is contradicted by experience, which records the origin of many words from an original subject-word, none from an original abstract general root. The theory, as an unsupported assumption, we are forced to believe must share the fate of the Professor's famous "ring" theory, and be gathered with the things that are doomed and are to be forgotten.—*Yale College Courant.*

## DORNER AND CHRISTLIEB.

[THE following sketches of the two eminent theologians named above, have been translated, at our request, by a member of our Senior class, from editorials (by Dr. Seibert, we presume), in the "*Deutscher Volksfreund*," published weekly by the American Tract Society:]

Among the foreign delegates to the Evangelical Alliance, Drs. I. A. Dorner and Theodor Christlieb occupy very prominent places, both in regard to ability and position. The former, Professor of Theology at the University of Berlin, Prussia, was well known to the theological world of this country before his visit as delegate to the Evangelical Alliance, both by his great work on "Christology" (which may be counted among the greatest theological productions of our age), and by the "History of Protestant Theology," published a few years ago, which is also an extraordinary work, manifesting a depth of research, connected with a clearness of thought and a simplicity and beauty of style which is really astonishing. Both of these works have made the name of the author renowned among the highly educated of Europe and America. A controversy between Dr. Dorner and Dr. Nevin, a few years ago, has served to make the former still better known to the Evangelical church of our land.

*Dr. Dorner* is, unquestionably, one of the greatest theologians that Germany has produced. He is a slender, middle-sized man. His hair is already tinged with gray by approaching age. With the exception of his high forehead and his clear, bright eyes, nothing betrays the great thinker in Dr. Dorner. What Karl Gerok says of Ludwig Uhland, could also be applied to Dr. Dorner. He makes more the impression of a good-natured village school teacher of olden times, than that of a great Professor of the University of Berlin. True goodness and kindness of heart beam from his whole countenance, and captivate at first sight. Dr. Dorner can speak the English language, but does not feel himself at home in it. Whoever, therefore, did not know him before, could scarcely judge rightly of the man by what he heard and saw of him at the Alliance. He read his paper (in English) on *Romanism and Nominal Protestantism*, before the Alliance, on Wednesday, October 8. That his discourse was rich in ideas, that he characterized with exactness both these forms of error, hostile

to Evangelical Christianity, and criticised them in a spirited, thorough and convincing manner, need scarcely be mentioned. Nothing less could be expected from Dr. Dorner. He strikingly marked the contrast between Roman Catholicism and false Protestantism, and then forcibly showed their inner affinity. He showed how both labor to establish the relation of authority and freedom; how Romanism one-sidedly lays stress on the conception of *authority*, false Protestantism on that of *freedom*; but how both again go hand-in-hand in this, that they set up, instead of the Word of God, a *human* autonomy. Romanism that of the Pope; false Protestantism that of the individual subject. It was a pity that Dr. Dorner could not read his paper in German; but that, in order to be understood, he was compelled to speak in a language with which he evidently was not familiar. Could he have spoken German, and read his paper in full, it would have made a much deeper impression.

[And yet, having heard it read, and observed the effect of it upon others around us, we feel assured that it was very generally understood and appreciated by all in the large audience who were within hearing distance of the speaker. That it would have made a deeper impression had it been read to an intelligent German assembly, in German, may certainly be admitted. But it was not by any means lost upon the Alliance. That part of the essay, especially, which exposed and deprecated the variety of false or nominal Protestantism, known as ritualistic and sacerdotal high-churchism, was manifestly very well understood; and the audience gave proof of its endorsement of the views expressed, by most cordial applause. There was hardly one in the hall who did not understand what Dr. Dorner meant by "duodecimo Popedom," and by "the foul stream now flowing through the Evangelical church of more than one land."—ED. MONTHLY.]

*Dr. Theodor Christlieb*, Professor of Theology at the University of Bonn, Prussia, has also shown himself a worthy representative to the Evangelical Alliance of that nation, which takes the lead in the sphere of theology and philosophy. On Monday, October 6, he delivered his discourse on the best method of combating infidelity, before the Alliance, in the hall of the Young Men's Christian Association. This discourse, although the speaker was compelled to compress it considerably in the English language, was a real masterpiece. The speaker, all aglow with, and wholly



animated by, his subject, yet always fully master of himself, proved himself to the crowded audience a master of Christian apologetics, such as they had scarcely ever seen before. After he had concluded, some of the greatest and most intelligent men were so moved and affected, that their eyes involuntarily filled with tears. It was generally acknowledged that Dr. Christlieb had won the palm of the day. It has become very prevalent in this country to talk of "German infidelity," and to expect every German theologian to be a rationalist, or half a skeptic. How greatly must have been the surprise of some, now, when they saw and heard a German theologian, who showed in a masterly manner how infidelity is to be combated and Christianity defended! who was found to be not only a thoroughly cultured man of science and philosophy, but also a true disciple of Jesus Christ! May Americans always remember, henceforth, whenever they are tempted to use the invective, "infidel Germans," that in October, 1873, one of the best defenders of eternal truth was found to be a German.

But it may be worth while to acquaint the reader a little more with this remarkable man, of whom they probably have heard less than of his distinguished senior, Dr. Dorner. Dr. Theodor Christlieb was born on the 7th of March, 1833, in Ludwigsburg, in the kingdom of Wirtemberg. His father, who was Dean in Ludwigsburg, died during the meeting of the Alliance. Some of his ancestors were prominent clergymen of Wirtemberg. Young Christlieb attended the Gymnasium in Tübingen, and there acquired, under Dr. Bäumlein, a famous philologist, in the years 1847-1851, a thorough classical training.

Being dismissed with high honors, he studied theology at the University in Tübingen, from 1851-1854. Here Oehler, Landerer, Beck, and Baur, were his teachers. He heard them all, learned from all, without attaching himself to any one in particular. They did not need to bring him to the Lord. His name was not only Christlieb, but he was a Christlieb; that is, a youth truly loving Christ. After acquiring new honors in his examination, he returned to his parents in Ludwigsburg, and there commenced his work upon "*Scotus Erigena*." He obtained the degree of Doctor of Divinity in 1857. After traveling some time in France and Spain, and enriching himself with the knowledge of the world and of human nature, he returned to Wirtemberg, and there received a charge near Stuttgart. But scarcely had he

been there a year, when he received a call from London, to establish an Evangelical congregation among the Germans living at Islington. Here he labored, under God's blessing, from 1858-1865. He succeeded in gathering a congregation, and building it up on a solid basis—the first Evangelical United German congregation in England. He also succeeded in building a beautiful church, which was dedicated on January 1, 1862, and led many souls to Christ.

In London, Dr. Christlieb came forward for the first time as defender of Christianity. He had established a Young Men's Christian Association, before whom he delivered Lectures in defence of Christian truth. With the year 1865, however, his labor in London ended. He received two calls at the same time. One came from St. Petersburg to a very high position; the other from Wirtemberg to a much humbler position. By the latter, he was to be minister in Friederichshafen, the summer residence of the king of Wirtembrg. His book upon Scotus Erigena, published in 1860, and evincing great learning and deep philosophical culture, had made the name of the author known far and near. He went to Friederichshafen, but not alone. In England, he had married a daughter of missionary Weitbrecht. While at Friederichshafen he was called upon to deliver apologetical lectures before the Evangelical Society of Switzerland. These lectures afterwards appeared in book form, under the title of "Modern doubts concerning the Christian faith." They belong to the best works that Christian Apologetics has brought forth.

After remaining a few years in Friederichshafen, Dr. Christlieb was called, in 1868, as Professor of Practical Theology in the University of Bonn, to the same chair which Nitzsch, Steinmyer and Rothe had occupied before him. In Bonn, Dr. Christlieb reads on Practical Theology, the Philosophy of Religion, Apologetics, Church Government and History of Missions. At the same time he is University preacher. It must seem difficult to take the place of such men as Nitzsch, Rothe and Steinmyer, but whoever has become fully acquainted with Dr. C., will be convinced that he has the ability to fill the place in a worthy manner. May God grant him long life and health; then Theological Science and the church can yet expect great things from Dr. Christlieb. In America he has won warm friends who will never forget him.

## COLLEGE ITEMS.

*Thirteen weeks* of what is called *the long Term*, have already passed, and the Christmas vacation hastens on. It seems scarcely credible, so pleasantly have the weeks glided by, each day occupied with its profitable, though perhaps somewhat arduous, duties. Already visions of anticipated festival delights flit across the minds of many dreamers by night, if, indeed, they do not trespass upon the minds of some who vainly strive to fix their thoughts upon more real things by day. Only be patient. The hours will fly rapidly enough. And after a term of earnest, persevering toil, the brief season of respite and rest will prove all the sweeter and more refreshing for having honestly earned a right to it, and accomplished something by faithful application to study.

The Fall Term of 1873 is entitled to an emphasized record in our College annals, as in some respects the most successful and cheering in our academic history. The school has been full beyond expectation, its roll numbering ninety students, and the work of the several departments has been prosecuted in a very satisfactory way. It is especially gratifying to be able to state, that in a moral and religious respect, the condition of things has been excellent. The Students' prayer meeting has been maintained with interest, and the Sunday afternoon College Bible Class has been found an instructive means of grace, as pleasant as it has been profitable.

For these things let the friends of Ursinus and its principles be thankful, and feel incited to redoubled efforts for the future. Each year successfully passed, seems to strengthen the foundation on which the Institution rests, and to make easier the work of building up on that foundation. And as the causes which led to the establishment of the Institution continue (in some respects we regret to say, unhappily) to, operate, and rather grow more intense with some recent developments, let our distinctive work be prosecuted with increasing earnestness and zeal.

*Acknowledgments.* Received for Educational aid in Ursinus College:

St. Paul's Reformed church, Lancaster,	- - -	\$50.00
Rev. Dr. Helffrich,	- - - - -	25.00
Rev. R. S. Appel, Hamburg,	- - - - -	32.00



*The Schaff Literary Society* will hold its *second* Anniversary on the evening of the 18th of December. This Society has been in operation during a period of nearly two years. It has been quite prosperous and has done an exceedingly good work. We commend the zeal and energy of its members, devoted, as they properly are, to the good cause of Christian education. The following gentlemen will represent the Society on the occasion, viz. F. M. Hobson, Salutatory; D. W. Ebbert, Oration; L. G. Kremer, Oration; A. M. Price, Oration; M. Peters, Eulogy; J. G. Neff, Schaff Oration. The exercises will be interspersed with appropriate music.

The Society extends a general invitation to all, and especially to the friends and patrons of the Institution.

---

## EDITOR'S DESK.

VOLUME VI, NUMBER 12. And thus endeth the sixth year of a periodical called into existence by circumstances which led many warm friends of our old Evangelical faith to hail its appearance, whilst others as ardently desired and boldly predicted, that it would run a brief course of one, or at most two years, and then ignominiously die for lack of a—Synodical apportionment. Few persons, beyond those who may occasionally get at our Editor's Desk, know what strenuous efforts were made, in various ways, to crush the *Monthly* out of being. Leaders of the movements whose views and measures we have exposed and opposed, seemed determined that it should be put down. And we have reason to feel persuaded, that some question like this was more than once discussed: Can we not in some way interpose the authority of the Synod to have that *Monthly* stopped?

It was, indeed, but a *Monthly*, and at the start only a 32-page periodical, like the *Guardian*. Nevertheless, as an outspoken witness of the Reformed faith against anti-Reformed innovations, it was dreaded and bitterly denounced.

But it still lives. It was begun in faith, and by faith it continues to this day. That it has not lived or labored in vain, is attested by many cheering facts. Important results secured, in large part, at least, by its instrumentality, are the best proofs of the wisdom of starting it, and of the service it has rendered.

Most of the reasons which led to its establishment continue in force. To stop it now, therefore, or to change its form (as has been contemplated and desired for two years past, at least by ourselves,) would leave its mission unfinished. It has, consequently, been thought best to continue its publication in its present form another year.

In yielding, however, to this determination, we must make an earnest appeal to friends, not only for their continued cooperation, but for increased efforts to enlarge its circulation. Our other pressing engagements render it simply impossible for us to give attention to the business part of the work involved in carrying on such an enterprise—getting subscribers, collecting dues, &c., and the terms at which the *Monthly* is furnished will not afford the employment of a business agent. Our friends must bear in mind, that we are furnishing for \$2.00, a year a periodical of as many pages in the aggregate as the *Mercersburg Review*, which costs \$3.00. Of course our labor and that of our kind contributors is thrown in gratuitously. More than this should not be expected.

Let us, therefore, confidently hope, as we earnestly request, that the hundreds who realize the value of the *Monthly*, and have declared to us by letter their appreciation of its efforts, will at once strive to help it along.

Above all, let all promptly pay up, and so relieve us of financial cares. There are too many in arrears for the past, and their neglect has occasioned embarrassment. Let such make amends, by adding advance pay to what they owe, and by doing it at once.

We can offer no bribes for the aid we ask. Our friends ask none. But, relying upon the same Divine help which has sustained us hitherto, we do promise to give full value in the contents of the *Monthly* for all it costs.

Persons remitting dues, will please be careful to send either good checks to our order, *Draft* on City Banks, or *Postal Orders* on Philadelphia.

To the above we add the following communication:

HILL DALE, Nov. 16th, 1873.

Dear Bro. Bomberger: At a recent meeting of the members of the Educational Committee, joined by other brethren of the church in full sympathy with Ursinus College and all its interests, some very important business was transacted, which, under the blessing of God, will result in much good to our Reformed Zion. The nature of it will transpire in due time. The following is an item which it affords me pleasure to transmit to you as Editor of our *Reformed Church Monthly*. Please publish the same in your pages for the benefit of your subscribers:

RESOLUTIONS.

"Resolved, That we will use our best endeavors to increase the circulation of the *Reformed Church Monthly*, regarding it as a true exponent of *Evangelical Reformed doctrines*, and eminently deserving of the confidence of our entire membership.

"Resolved, That the church owes a debt of gratitude to Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., for his unceasing labors as Editor of the *Monthly*, and we rejoice in the sure indications manifesting themselves that the church is awakening to the importance of saving herself from the errors of Ritualism and Romanism."

You may expect encouraging additions to your subscription list. Everybody present was unwilling to have the *Monthly* discontinued. Its work is not yet done. God bless you and your co-laborers.

CORRESPONDENT.

*Creation or Emanation.* At last we have succeeded in pressing our Lancaster friends to at least an approximate admission of the radical, fundamental error of their system. Mr. Rupp's articles led to a discussion in our pages, which has forced Lancaster, as an endorser of Mr. R., into a dilemma. Either they had to retract the plainly pantheising ground taken by Mr. R., or by defending his position they had to come out more fully on the subject. As Mr. R., however, had really only repeated what leaders in his school had said before, though not quite so plumply, they could not well go back on him, without damaging themselves. So they have chosen the other alternative. They have come out more openly, written in plainer terms, than ever before. Of course what is said, is said as cautiously as possible; is presented in the most plausible and least objectionable way. This was to be expected. The whole of the theory has not yet been brought out. Probably it has not yet been fully matured in their own minds. Enough, however, has been exhibited to enable any intelligent person to see and say what it is. An elephant can be told by his proboscis and his tusks.

The subject has been considered in a previous article, entitled: *What is it?* Will our friends please read that article carefully.

Now, then, all may know the first and fundamental article of the Lancaster creed. It is: I believe in God as the eternal source of substantial emanation for all spiritual intelligent beings. This explains much in their system that may have seemed strange and inexplicable before. It explains their peculiar theory of the Incarnation. It explains their bewilderment in regard to the atonement. It explains their awkward struggle to explain away the doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism of the ground and foundation of our salvation. It explains their pantheising view of regeneration and of the sacraments. In a word, it explains their antagonisms to Evangelical Christianity in its essential principles and fundamental doctrines. They hold and strive to carry out an *emanation theory* of all things, in distinction from, and in opposition, to the old Scriptural doctrine of *Creation*. This now is their starting-point. Let it be fully developed.

*A Confession.*—Since writing the above item, the party referred to has come out with the following confession: "We regret that Mr. Rupp employs the word "*emanation*" in this connection. Strictly taken, it makes him say what he does not intend to say, as is clear from the whole context."

Let due credit be given for this concession. It may, possibly, be thought forced and reluctant. As it is, however, it is worth a good deal. That Lancaster should regret the use of that word, can be well understood. There are several reasons for such regret.

But we must differ from the assertion, that it makes Mr. Rupp and Lancaster say what the context does not mean, by necessary implication. In proof of this, we need only give and mark Mr. Rupp's explanation of the matter. He says: "God did not breathe a part of Himself into man's nostrils, in order to make him a living soul; *although what He did breathe into him, was an emanation from Himself, and not a created element.*"



Here there seems to be a contradiction between the first and second parts of the sentence. For how could something *emanate* from God Himself, without being a part of Himself, *unless it were a creation*, which Mr. R. says it was not? The explanation of this incongruity is furnished, in some measure, by Mr. R., when he says that by a part of Himself he does not mean that God's being thereby became "less than it was before."

He *does mean*, therefore, that a part, or a portion of God's being, did actually *emanate* to Adam in his creation; only this was effected in such a way, that God's proper being or substance was not diminished by the act.

Meaning this, we cannot see by what other term he could have expressed his view. It was the very word for the place and sense, as the context clearly shows. That God did not lose a part of His substance by the act, that is, that by some means He produced Adam by emanation from Himself without diminishing the sum total of his own substance, *no way* changes the pantheistic character of the doctrine advanced. It may open other questions. But, still the fact remains that, according to the Lancaster theory, man is a substantial emanation from God, and that is the kernel of pantheism.

What is stated in the confession about *emanation*, signifying a "*flowing forth*" (which every body knows) comes in rather strangely as a reason for regretting that Mr. R. used the word. Why, in the very paper read by a representative of Lancaster at the Evangelical Alliance (a paper, by the way, which produced but very little impression), and the publication of which, in a "certain periodical," is heralded with loud laudations, this very phrase "*flowing forth*," is used more than once, and apparently in the strongest sense of the term "*emanation*," however much that sense may be covered over with a multitude of specious words.

"*Is it honest?*" The article containing the concessions just noticed, closes with this pointed question. Most promptly do we admit its propriety. It is an appeal to *motives*, and we have always held that in all such matters *motives*, as they may be fairly judged by acts, are open to criticism. In this particular case, the question impliedly charges us with not having been *honest*; that is, frank, fair, and just, in quoting from Mr. Rupp's article. Conscious of a desire to be just and clear of any design or effort to misquote or misrepresent, we can unhesitatingly declare, that we did act honestly in the case. And we feel sure that any one reading Mr. R.'s assertions on the point exposed, must admit that we only did what his words and statements warranted and required. It was not necessary to quote a half page when the gist of his view was contained in the sentence cited, and all else only an amplification of it. We did quote fairly and truly. If the Faculty at Lancaster regret a too plain exposure of their error, we cannot help that. Let them renounce their false doctrine, or take its legitimate consequences. Our criticisms upon Mr. R.'s Lancaster doctrine of *regeneration*, honestly and truly set forth the theory he and his school advocate, and which we utterly reject. Let there be no skulking behind the worn-out complaint, *misunderstood*. This has been confirmed in the preceding editorial item, as well as in the article: *What is it?*

But now, since the Lancaster conscience has been touched regarding the,

virtue of honesty, how easy it would be to turn upon it and ask seven times over in reference to as many distinct points of most vital concern to our church—IS IT HONEST? The questions cannot, however, be pressed now. They may serve as a text for a future article.

---

## BOOK NOTICES.

FROM the *Presbyterian Board of Publication*, 1334 Chestnut street, Philadelphia:

1. "The Communion Table," by Rev. J. R. Boyd, D.D., and "Pray for your Children," by Rev. William Scribner, are two admirable treatises upon subjects of the highest practical importance, and deserve to be especially commended for their comprehensive brevity, clearness, and unction.

*Princeton Review*: The October number of the *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* has appeared, with the following list of contents: The Modern English Pulpit; Faith, Its Place and Prerogative; The New Testament Meaning of Eternity and Eternal; The Vatican Council; The Necessity of Religious Instruction in Colleges; Infant Baptism; Life and its Origin; The Harmony of the Gospel Accounts of Christ's Resurrection; The Contrast between Man and the Brute Creation Establishes the Divine Origin of the Scriptures; Eating and Drinking Unworthily; Notes on Current Topics; Contemporary Literature; Theological and Literary Intelligence. This number of the *Review* contains much valuable matter, and the discussions of the topics are able and interesting. We are convinced that it is of great importance to our whole church that this *Review* should be generously sustained.

Among our valuable exchanges, we notice that *The Methodist* has adopted, and the *Christian Intelligencer*, (Reformed), both published in New York, is about to adopt the quarto or large octavo form. This we consider a decided improvement. The immense folio size of most of our religious weeklies has always seemed to us awkward and undesirable. It is almost impossible to preserve them in proper files, and hence, as soon as they are read they are apt to be thrown away. The adoption of the smaller form will doubtless secure the preservation of much valuable reading.

---

## MONTHLY SUMMARY.

OUR OWN BRANCH—*Pastoral Changes*. The Rev. P. A. Long, from Navarre, Ohio, to Taneytown, Md. Rev. F. Wall, to Pine Grove, Mercer county, Pa. Rev. J. H. Stepler, to Attica, Ohio. Rev. Stoeckel, to Dale city charge. Rev. J. W. Ebbinghaus, to St. Paul's congregation, Pittsburg. Rev.



*H. W. Hoffmeier*, to Zion's Valley charge. *Rev. L. B. Leashure*, to Fountain Mills, Westmoreland county, Pa. *Rev. C. A. Limberg*, from Williamsburg, N. Y., to Butler, Pa. *Rev. I. S. Weiss*, from Upper Mt. Bethel, Northampton county, Pa., to Paradise charge, York county; address, York, Pa. *Rev. Samuel Shaw*, from Congress, Ohio, to Salem, Pa. *Rev. J. K. Millet*, to McEwensville, Northumberland county, Pa.

*Growth of the Churches.*—To Somerset charge, Ohio, *Rev. C. W. Hoyman*, 19 were added; to St. John's, Somerset, Pa., *Rev. J. W. Anspach*, 18; to New Holland, Pa., *Rev. D. W. Gerhard*, 23; to Trinity church, Coplay, Pa., *Rev. S. A. Leinbach*, 10; to Beaver charge, Clarion county, *Rev. D. O. Shoemaker*, 33; to Trinity, Friends' Cove, *Rev. W. M. Deatrich*, 6; to Columbia, Pa., *Rev. C. Cleaver*, 25; to Canton, Ohio, *Rev. E. Herbruck*, 12; to Trinity, Philadelphia, *Rev. D. E. Klopp*, 8.

By special communications we learn that the recent Communion season at the First Reformed church, *Lebanon*, Pa., *Rev. F. W. Kremer*, D.D., was a season of more than ordinary interest. Both the English and German services were more largely attended than ever before. Fifty-two persons were added to the church, including 45 by confirmation, and 15 heads of families.

In *Womelsdorf*, also, the communion recently observed is reported to have been an occasion of marked solemnity and interest, most cheering alike to the pastor, *Rev. George Wolff*, and people. The addition to the church numbered 18.

*The Synod of the Potomac*, which met in Chambersburg on October 22d, is reported to have been largely attended, and to have had interesting sessions. Beside the items of business usually demanding action, an earnest effort was made toward the formal establishment of a theological seminary in connection with Mercersburg College. This movement met with some pretty strong opposition, but we are not prepared to give precisely the result. The manifestly just decision of the General Synod, at Cincinnati in the Dunn appeal case, involving the right of every Christian and congregation to select its own proper objects of benevolent contributions, seems to have been quite unsatisfactory to some parties.

*The General Synod of Pittsburg* met in Titusville, Pa. Its proceedings display commendable vigor in the prosecution of the various interests in hand. From the financial items of some of the reports acted upon, it is evident either that the churches of this Synod have more wealth than those of other Synods, or that the members are far more liberal in proportion to their means. On one point, we have noticed, some members of the Synod seem not to have had enough to do with their own particular work, and so traveled rather out of the way to revive the dispute regarding the right of ministers connected with Ursinus College to teach theology, and so aid in the important and needful work of training young men for the preaching of the Gospel. The next General Synod is to be overturned on this subject. Thus this bone of contention is thrown among us afresh. It may seem rather unfortunate that the *paper* of the the Synod, which seemed to plead so earnestly for a cessation of hostilities



among us, should have so soon to follow up its appeal for peace with the publication of what may be regarded as a challenge to fresh controversy upon a point which has been fairly settled by the highest judicatory of the church. But those who have thus challenged to war must take the responsibility.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS.—It will be remembered that in our November report of the Evangelical Alliance, it was stated that at the Communion service in Dr. Adams' church, some Episcopalians united with others in the solemnity. Among these was Bishop *Cummins*, of Kentucky. This act subjected him to a severe published censure, by a certain Bishop Tozer, of Zanzibar, whose assault was afterwards endorsed by Bishop Potter, of New York. The result has been Bishop Cummins' resignation of his office as Bishop of Kentucky, and to a movement contemplating the establishment of an Episcopal church on a broader and more truly Catholic basis than that on which the ruling powers in that church are now controlling it.

Many earnest Evangelical Episcopalians regret the course Bishop Cummins is taking. They regard it as hasty, and likely to do their cause more harm than good. The case is peculiar, and compassed with peculiar difficulties. Whilst, therefore, Bishop Cummins' plan may seem unadvisable, the issue may prove that he and his friends are under the guidance of the Spirit, and doing the best thing under the circumstances.

THE correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette* gives the latest data as to the progress of the Protestant Episcopal mission in Bengal. It appears from his letters, that the total number of communicants in that province is 93,098 souls, of whom 70,000 were born and bred in India, and 50,000 are pure natives. The report of the Missionary Conference at Allahabad has just published the statistics for all India. Unfortunately it deals only with the Protestant natives, who number 224,161. The most remarkable feature disclosed by the missionary statistics, is the rapid progress of proselytism during late years. Between 1861 and 1871 the number has more than doubled in Bengal, while the communicants have increased nearly three-fold. In Central India native communicants have multiplied by nearly 400 per cent.; in Oudh by 175 per cent.; in the north-western provinces it is nearly doubled; in the Punjab and Bombay it has increased by 64 per cent., and the total increase for all India is 61 per cent. The increase during the previous ten years, from 1851 to 1861, was only 53 per cent. The missionaries calculate that, assuming a uniform increase of 61 per cent. for each ten years, the number of native Protestants in India will amount in 1951 to 11,000,000, and in A. D. 2001, 130,000,000.

THE University of Leipsic has come to outrank in numbers all the other German universities. During the last session 2,772 students attended its lectures. Of these 421 were "theologians." Berlin has fallen from 2,600 students in the winter of 1871-72 to 1,500 this summer! The Prussian government, it is charged, is too stingy to employ first-class talent.

# SPECIAL CARD.

---

## DO YOU TAKE THE REFORMED CHURCH MONTHLY?

It is a monthly periodical of 56 pages, making a volume of 672 pages a year, which can be easily preserved and bound at the end of the year.

*Its great object* is to set forth, maintain and defend the long settled faith and practice of the Reformed church, the principles and doctrines of the church, and to do this in opposition to all efforts made to change both, and to introduce high church, sacerdotal, ritualistic and Romanizing errors.

*In its matter* and style, it may be called a practical, popular Review, calculated to instruct the reader upon subjects of vital importance, to strengthen them in the faith, and to warn and fortify them against deceitful, misleading errors.

*Every member of the Reformed Church* should take it. It supplies them with substantial and profitable articles, such as are not usually published in a weekly paper.

*It costs* but \$2 a year, and for that sum gives more original reading matter than any other religious monthly we know of.

*Try it* for one year, and, like nearly all others who have done so, and love the old faith more than attempted innovations, you will hardly give it up.

Apply to the publisher and principal editor,

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,

(Collegeville P. O.,) Freeland, Montgomery co., Pa.



# URSINUS COLLEGE,

FREELAND, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA.

WINTER TERM. 1874.

---

## ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT.

The NEXT TERM of this popular Boarding School for Young Men, commences Monday, JANUARY 5th, 1874, and continues sixteen weeks. Instruction given by a corps of competent teachers in the elementary and higher branches of an English and Classical education, in German and other Modern Languages, in Music, Drawing and Painting.

TERMS for Boarding and Tuition (French, Music, Drawing and Painting extra), at the rate of \$180 for the school year of 40 weeks.

---

## COLLEGIATE DEPARTMENT.

The College proper is distinct from the Academic Department. The sessions of both correspond. Applications for admission to the several classes can be made at any time.

The FACULTY consists of the following gentlemen:

J. H. A. BOMBERGER, D.D., PRESIDENT, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, &c.

REV. H. W. SUPER, A.M., VICE PRESIDENT, Professor of Mathematics, Mechanics, &c.

J. SHELLEY WEINBERGER, A.M., Professor of Latin and Greek Languages, &c.

REV. JOHN VAN HAAGEN, A.M., Professor of German, History, &c.

SAMUEL V. RUBY, Esq., A.M., Professor of Natural Sciences, Belles Letters, &c.

J. W. SUNDERLAND, A.M., L.D.D., Professor of Geology, Chemistry and Botany.

H. T. SPANGLER, A.B., and J. H. SECHLER, A.B., Instructors in the Academic Department.

A. E. DAHLMAN, Tutor.

H. J. WELKER, Instructor in Penmanship.

A full Theological course has been added for the free use of those who may wish to avail themselves of it.

For further information regarding terms, etc., apply to

J. H. A. BOMBERGER,  
Freeland, Montgomery County, Penna.